A Farther Discussion OF THAT Great Point in DIVINITY the *Sufferings of Christ*, AND The Questions about his Righteousnesse { *Active* / *Passive*, and the Imputation thereof.

BEING A *Vindication* of a Dialogue, Intituled [*The Meritorious Price of our Redemption, Justification, &c.*] from the exceptions of Mr. *Norton* and others.

By WILLIAM PYNCHON, late of New England.

LONDON,
Printed for the Author, and are to bee sold at the Signe of the three Lyons in Corn-hill, over against the Conduit, *M DC LV.*

XUM

A Farther Discussion

OF THAT

Great Point in DIVINITY the *Sufferings of Christ*,

AND

The Questions about his Righteousnesse

Active

Passive,

and the Imputation thereof.

BEING

A *Vindication* of a Dialogue, Intituled [*The Meritorious Price of our Redemption, Justification, &c.*] from the exceptions of Mr. *Norton* and others.

By WILLIAM TINCHON, late of New England.

LONDON,
Printed for the Author, and are to be sold at the Sign of the three Lyons in Corn-hill, over against the Conduit. MDCLV.

To the Honorable

OLIVER ST. IOHN;

Lord Chief Juſtice of the Common-Pleas;

Peace be multiplied.

SIR,

I Humbly preſent this inſuing Controverſie to your Honor, becauſe I deem you to be an able Judge, not onely in thoſe Controverſies that concern the common Laws of this Land; but alſo in Divine Controverſies, and eſpecially in this inſuing Controverſie, becauſe it hath ſo much dependance on ſundry ſorts of Scripture-Laws and Covenants, in all which you cannot chuſe but have a judicious inſpection, as well as into the Laws of this Land; and the rather, becauſe the Laws of *England*, have either in their riſe, or in their uſe, ſome relation to the ſaid Scripture Laws and Covenants.

1 This inſuing Controverſie hath ſome relation to the moral Law of Nature, in which *Adam* was created. And this Law, though I call it the moral Law of Nature, yet I do not call it the Covenant of Nature, which God made with *Adam* touching mans nature in general, as my Opponent doth.

2 It hath ſome relation to that ſpecial poſitive Law and

Covenant which God made with *Adam* (concerning mans nature) as he was ordained to be the head of mans Nature in general; For God gave unto *Adam* two symbolical Trees, unto which he annexed a Promise as well as a threatning, namely, *That in case he did first eat of the Tree of Life, then his Promise and Covenant* (which was necessarily implyed) *was, That he and all his natural posterity should be confirmed in his created natural perfections for ever; But in case he did first eat of the Tree of Knowledge of good and evil, then his threatning was, That both he and all his natural posterity should die a spiritual death in sin.*

3 It hath some relation to the Laws of a Combate for the trial of the mastery; for at the first the Devil thought that he had got the full victory over all mankind by drawing *Eve* to eat of the forbidden fruit; but God told the Devil in *Gen.*3.15. That he would put an utter enmity between him and the seed of that woman which he had deceived and conquered, and that one of her seed should combate with him, and break his cunning Head-plot, by continuing constant in his obedience, through all his ill usage; until he had made his soul a sacrifice of Reconciliation. And moreover, God told the Devil, that he should have his full liberty to provoke his patience, and to hinder him in the course of his obedience, by his ill usage, and that he should have so much power granted him, as to pierce him in the foot-soals for a sinful Malefactor on the cross, to try if by any ill usage, either by fraud or force, he could provoke his patience to make him sin against the Laws of the Combate. And God also warned the Devil by his proclamed Declaration, That in case he could not prevail by all his ill usage to disturb the passions of the seed of the woman, nor any other way to divert him in the course

of his obedience, then this seed of the woman (by the onely weapon of his righteousness) should break his Head-plot in peeces, and so should get the victory of the Victor; and rescue the spoil from his power (or at the least the best part of the spoil) namely, the Elect; and so it was prophecied of this blessed seed, in *Isa.* 53.12. *That he should divide the spoil with the strong*, namely with the strong enemy Satan.

4 It hath some relation to the Laws of the Eternal Covenant, between the Father and the Son for mans Redemption; for God could not have declared the said Laws of the Combate for the Victory, except there had gone before hand an eternal consent, decree and Covenant between the Father and the Son, for the trial of this Combate, in order to the redemption of the Elect from Satans head-plot: Therefore from this declared combate, in *Gen.* 3.15. it follows by necessary consequence, that the second person did from eternity Covenant to take unto him mans true nature from the seed of the deceived sinful woman, and in that nature, as it was accompanied with our true infirmities of Fear, Sorrow, &c. to enter the Lists, and to combate with Satan for the end aforesaid. And 2. Hence it also follows by necessary consequence, That God the Father did Covenant to and with his Son, that in case the Devil could not by all his ill usage prevail to disturb his humane passions, nor could by any other way divert him in the course of his obedience, until he had finished all his sufferings, and until at last, in that obedience, he had made his soul a sacrifice, then he would accept of the perfection of his righteousness and obedience, both in his combate and also in the formality of his death, by his own Priestly power, as a sweet smelling sacrifice, and thereupon would be reconciled to the Elect, and receive them again into special favor, as Sons, by Adoption.

A learned Divine saith thus,

The fundamental grounds of Christianity, do inforce us to grant, That in the Divine nature (though most indivisibly one) there is an eminent ideal pattern, of such a distinction as we call between party and party, a capacity to give, and a capacity to receive; a capacity to demand, and a capacity to satisfie, &c.

5 From this eternal Decree and Covenant between the Father and the Son, doth result the New Covenant with the Elect; For it pleased them to agree, That all the Articles of the New Covenant, should be ratified and confirmed to the Elect by the death of Christ, and from that confirmation by his death; It is now stiled the New Testament, *Heb.*9.15,16.

6 Presently after the Declaration of the said Enmity and Combate in *Gen.*3.15. namely, in verse 19. It pleased God further to declare the Council of his will to fallen (but now also converted) *Adam*, That he should return to the dust whence he was taken, *Gen.*3.19.

And this is also further to be noted, That God denounced this judicial sentence of a bodily death on him, as a just punishment for his original spiritual death in sin; and this is also further evident by *Rom.*5.12.

And secondly, The Apostle doth also further tell us, That when God appointed a bodily death to *Adams* sinful nature, that he also did at the very same time appoint a judgement for each departed soul, *Heb.*9.27. namely,

First, That such as dyed in the faith of their Redemption by the seed of the woman, should bee judged to ever-

everlasting life; and to the sentence of their bodily death should at the last be turned into a blessing to them.

But secondly, That such as believed not their Redemption by this seed of the woman, the sentence of their bodily death should being a greater judgement to them, because it should be an inlet to their eternal death in hell, *Joh.3.36.*

7 Hence it also follows by necessary consequence, That when God proclaimed this Combate and victory, he did exemplifie the manner of the victory to *Adam* by the death of some Lamb, which God commanded *Adam* to offer in Sacrifice (as I have shewed it more at large in my Treatise of the Institution of the Sabbath) and ever after, God did exemplifie the same to the Fathers, both before, and after the Flood.

8 Before the Flood, it is said, That *Abel* did offer a better sacrifice than *Cain*, because he offered it in faith, *Gen.4. Heb.11.4.*

9 Immediately after the Flood, *Noah* is said to offer sacrifice for a sweet savor of rest unto God, *Gen.8.21.* because such Sacrifices were ordained to typifie Gods full rest, and sweet content in the perfect obedience of Christ, first in his Combate, and at last in his Sacrifice, as it is opened in *Eph.5.2.*

10 After this, God is said to preach the Gospel unto *Abraham*, *Gal.* 3.8, 16. and how else did he preach the Gospel, but by declaring in what manner the Seed of the woman should break the Serpents Head-plot? and therefore when God renewed his Promise and Covenant of blessedness to *Abraham* (by telling him that this Seed of the woman should come out of his loins) He gave this Testimony of *Abraham*, That he

did

did obey his voyce, and keep his charge, his Commandements, his Statutes, and his Laws, Gen. 26.5. *And that he would teach his children and his houshold after him* (as all the godly Fathers did) *to keep the way of the Lord*, *Gen.* 18. 19. namely, to keep the way of true Religion, or the way of Redemption by the Seed of the woman, that was promised to come out of his loyns.

4 After this, it pleased the Lord to separate *Israel* to be his peculiar people in Covenant; And then at Mount *Sinai* he gave them the ten Commandements, as a Covenant of Grace (as many learned Divines do of late rightly call it) for the regulating of their faith and obedience, in the course of their lives, together with certain other voluntary, ceremonial and typical Laws, and with certain Judicial Laws (many of which were also typical) and these Laws in their outward bodily use were called the first Covenant (of works) in respect of their lawful and legal appearing before Gods presence in his Sanctuary, but the same Laws in their mystical and spiritual use were given as a Covenant of grace, and as the Law of faith, though after a while, the *Jews* under the New Testament, did mistake Gods end in giving them, for they did relye upon their outward obedience to them as Idolaters do, for their eternal justification and salvation.

5 Besides these typical ceremonial Laws, It pleased God to ordain some other voluntary, positive, ceremonial Laws (which were no way typical in relation to our redemption by Christ as the former were) but were ordained only for the trial of some particular mans obedience in some one particular act; and such was the command of God to *Saul* to destroy the *Amalekites* utterly, without sparing any thing, 1 *Sam.* 15. And such

also

also was the command of God to *David*, to hang up seven of *Sauls* sons to pacifie his wrath, though some of them, if not all of them, might be innocent of *Sauls* sin, 2 *Sam.* 21. And such also was the command of God to the young Prophet, not to eat any bread in that place, nor to return the same way that he came, 1 *King.* 13. 9. *&c.*

This insuing controversie hath relation often to some one or other of these Laws and Covenants, as also to the Law of Suretiship for life, in the case of capital crimes: In all which Laws and Covenants, your Lordship cannot but have a deep inspection; and therefore I have the rather been bold to dedicate this insuing Controversie to your Honours judgement.

And now my humble Request to your Honour is,

1 That where you find any thing that doth not accord to the truth in your judgement, that you will bee pleased either to vouchsafe me your Animadversions, or else to lay it aside in silence, as you do other mens Tenents that you like not.

2 That where you find any thing that doth accord to the truth (which my soul loveth and longeth after) that you will be pleased to vouchsafe it so much grace in your sight, as to protect and defend it, according to God, whereof I nothing doubt, as being verily perswaded that your Lordship doth account it your greatest honour to be every way serviceable to God, and his truth, as it is in Jesus.

And that you may be still guided in the wayes of truth and life, until you obtain the end of your faith, even the salvation of your soul. It is the hearty prayer of

Your Honours most humble servant,

WILLIAM PYNCHON.

TO THE

Confiderate and Judicious Reader.

IN this insuing Reply, both to Mr. Norton's Foundation-principles, and also to his several Answers to the Dialogue (called, The Meritorious price of mans Redemption) I do often conclude my several Replies with this intreaty to the Judicious Reader, to judge between us, which of us doth give the rightest sense of the blessed Scriptures in these insuing Controversies.

Paul did much commend the Synagogue of the Bereans, for their better, more noble, and more ingenuous disposition (beyond the Synagogue of the Thessalonians,) because, they searched the Scriptures daily whether these things were so or no, as Paul had taught in their Synagogue, Act. 17. 11.

For in two main points of Religion touching mans Redemption, (which Paul taught in their Synagogue) he differed much from their common received opinion:

For first, he proved and alledged from the Scriptures, That the Messiah must needs have suffered (namely, that by the necessity of the eternal Decree and Covenant, he must needs take on him our true humane nature from the Seed of the woman, and that in that nature as it was accompanied with our true humane infirmities and passions, he must needs enter the Lists and Combate with Satan for the victory, for God had proclaimed an utter enmity between them in Gen. 3. 15.) and then he also told the Devil that he should have full liberty and power to peirce this Seed of the woman in the foot-soals, as a sinful Malefactor on the Crosse.

And

And secondly, How opened and alledged from the Scriptures, That the Messiah must also of necessity rise again from death to life on the third day, Act. 17. 3.

In these two main points, Paul *differed much from the common received opinion of the* Jews; *for their common received opinion was, That their Messiah should come into the world as a stately conquering Monarch, to redeem them from the Tyranny of the Nations of the world and to restore them again into their own land, in a more glorious manner than ever before.*

And secondly, it was their common opinion, that their Messiah should not dye at all, but that he should continue alive for ever in his stately Monarchy.

This was their common received opinion of Redemption by the Messiah, as it is evident by Joh. 12, 23, 32, 34. *and by* Jonathans *Paraphrase, and by their* Thalmud, *which is cited by* Maymony, *and translated by Mr.* Bro. *in* Eccles. p. 31. *&c.*

And therefore when Paul *opened and alledged from the Scriptures that the Messiah must needs have suffered from Satan and his Instruments for their redemption, it was a great stumbling block of offence to the* Jews *in general,* 1 Cor. 1. 23. *and yet notwithstanding some few of their* Hebrew *Doctors held and wrote otherwise, namely, That the Messiah must suffer much evil from the enmity of Satan; For saith* Du Plessis *in the Towne of Religion, page* 531. *Some of the* Rabbins *in the* Thalmud *say, That Christ should be distressed as a woman that labors of a child, according as* Jeremy *saith, He had great Anguishes to suffer but that he would indure them willingly to deliver man from sin. And (saith he)* Rab. Hadarson *saith, That Satan should be an enemy to him, and to his Disciples. And, saith he, in the book of* Ruth, *where it is written,* Eat thy bread, and temper it with vinegar. *This Bread (saith the Commentary) is the bread of the anointed King (or Messiah) who shall be broken for mans sin, and indure great torments, as it is written in* Isaiah. *And saith he,* Rabbi Symeon Ben Jochai *writeth thus, We worth the Murtherers of* Israel, *for they shall kill Christ; God will send his Son clothed in mans flesh to wash them, and they will kill him: And saith he, Whereas it is said, we be healed by his death (or stripes) the ancient* Cabalists *understand it of Christ, and say that the Angels had taught them, that the cleansing away of sin*

should be done upon Wood. And saith Du Plessis in page 478. Rab. Hechadosh saith, That the Messiah shall by his death save Adams race, and deliver mens souls from Hell, and therefore hee shall be called, Saviour.

And secondly, Some few of the Hebrew Doctors did also hold the Resurrection of the Messiah; For saith Du Plessis in page 532, 533. Rab. Hadarson, and Rab. Hachadosh, and Rab. Jonathan the son of Uzziel, and others, do expound these Texts of the Resurrection of Christ, Thou wilt not suffer thy holy One to see corruption; And he shall be raised again within the third day, for it is written, He will quicken us after two dayes, and in the third day will he raise us up again: And say the Rabbins in Bresith Rabba commenting on Gen. 22.4. There are many a three dayes in the holy Scriptures, of which one is the Resurrection of the Messiah, See Ainsi. in Gen. 22.4.

These two points of Doctrine which was scoffed at by the wise Philosophers of the Gentiles, Act. 17.18 &c. (which was held but by a very few among the Jews) Paul taught to be the only truth in their Synagogues, and he opened and alledged the Scriptures to prove these points.

But because those points of Doctrine were contrary to their now common received opinion, Therefore the Church or Synagogue of Thessalonica (being forestalled by their erroneous judgements) were inraged at it, and like mad men, did tooth and nayl persecute Paul for it, but yet he was hid from their rage, and he that held the truth was glad to obscure himself at the present, and to haste away out of their Jurisdiction unto the Jurisdiction of the Synagogue of Berea; But when the Jews of Thessalonica had knowledge thereof, they sent thither also, and stirred up the people against Paul, verse 13. because hee held and taught the said Doctrine there.

But although at the first it seemed very strange, and new, to them of Berea, as it did to them of Thessalonica, yet they did not persecute Paul for it, because the chief Rulers there were of a more wise, temperate and noble disposition than they of Thessalonica, and therefore they took a wiser course: For they searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so or no: And this is worthy of all due consideration, that they did not content themselves with a superficial search of one day and away, but they made

made it their daily work to search the Scriptures, neither did they trust only to the Expositions of those Hebrew Doctors that were now commonly received, but they searched into the Scriptures themselves, conferring what Paul had taught, and his proofs, with the Doctrine of Moses, and the Prophets, held forth in the Old Testament, 2 Pet. 1. 19. concerning the promised Messiah where the first Scripture to be examined is in Gen. 3. 15.

And first, By this means Pauls two points of Doctrine which seemed new to them, at the first shew, was found by them to be the only true Doctrine of the blessed Scriptures; and by that means many of them believed the said points, with many honourable women, which were Greeks and of men not a few, verse 12.

Secondly, By this mean Pauls new Doctrine (in shew) escaped the odium of Heresie in this place.

Thirdly, By this means the Synagogue of Berea escaped from being ranked by the holy Ghost in the number of the other inraged zealous persecutors of the truth.

I do earnestly therefore intreat thee, Good Reader, as thou desirest to escape the odium of a Persecutor, and as thou desirest to have the like commendations with those of Berea, search the blessed Scriptures, not only superficially, and by some common received Expositors, but search them deliberately, and search them daily, and then thou shalt be the better able to try which of us do give the true sense of the blessed Scriptures, for as Peter saith of Pauls Epistle to the dispersed Hebrews, some things are hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also other Scriptures, to their own destruction, 2 Pet. 3. 16. and therefore be diligent in thy search, and the rather, because Interpreters give variety of interpretations, and therefore look well to the Context, and look well to the force and use of the original word, by comparing it with the Context, and with other Scriptures, for when Paul went about to convince error, and to confirm the truth, he disputed out of the Scriptures, Act. 17. 2. and so Apollos disputed out of the Scriptures, Act. 18. 28. And our Savior said, Ye erre, not knowing the Scriptures, Mat. 22. 29. meaning thereby, that they did erre, because they did mis-understand the Scriptures; for though they knew the letter of the Scriptures, and had them in great reverence, yet they did erre because through a superficial perusal, they took them in a wrong sense.

Now the first Scripture wherein the true Plat-form of our Redemption is first declared, is Gen. 3. 15. *In this Scripture God doth first proclaim an utter enmity between the seed of the Woman and the seed of the Serpent; and in that Text God told the Devil, that one of the seed of that deceived sinful Woman, should in his true humane nature try Masteries with him, and conquer him, and he told Satan that he should have his full liberty to do what he could, either by fraud or by force, to hinder this seed of the Woman from breaking his Head-plat, and so from winning the prize of mans Redemption, and therefore God gave him full liberty to use him as a sinful Malefactor, and to pierce him in the Foot-soals, to try if by any means he could disturb his patience; And in this Combate Christ covenanted that his humane nature should strive lawfully, and not suffer his patience to be disturbed, nor his obedience to be any wayes perverted, until he had finished the Combate with Satan, and then he also covenanted in the perfection of that obedience to make his soul a Sacrifice for the procuring of Gods Reconciliation.*

And hence it also follows, That God the Father had covenanted to, and with Christ, that he would accept his Combate, and his Sacrifice, as a valuable consideration for the procuring of his Reconciliation to all the Elect.

And thus it was declared that the seed of the Woman should break the Devils Head-plat, and win the prize, which was the Redemption of all the Elect from Satans spoyl.

And first, From this Proclamation of Enmity, and from this first Declaration of the Combate with Satan, and of the Victory by the seed of the deceived Woman in Gen. 3. 15. *must all the following Scriptures have reference for their true Exposition.*

And secondly, From this Scripture it is most evident, That all Christs outward sufferings were by Gods appointment to be inflicted on him from the malice of Satan, and his Instruments; and that all his inward sufferings in his vital soul, were to be assumed and exercised from his own true humane affections and passions (which he took from the seed of the Woman) in relation to his ill usage from his Enemy Satan.

And thirdly, Neither in this, nor in any following Scripture, is there any mention that Christ was to be made a sinner by Gods judicial imputation, there is no such Court-language in the

Scriptures

Scriptures, neither is the term Hell-torments, nor the second death, nor the term Inflicted from Gods immediate wrath, applied to Christ, neither in this, nor in any other Scripture, though Mr. Norton hath perverted most dangerously many of the blessed Scriptures so to speak.

Fourthly, When this first Declaration in Gen.3.15. is rightly understood, and inferred with all the other Scriptures that speak of Christs sufferings; it will fully declare, That Mr. Nortons Tenents are most dangerously erroneous; and it will confirm the truth of the Dialogue.

Fifthly, This Text of Gen.3.15. being rightly understood will be a generall Key to open all the other Scriptures that speak of the sufferings of Christ, in their right sense.

Sixthly, In this Scripture is set out both the person and office of the Mediator.

First, The term he relates to his humane nature from the seed of the Woman.

And secondly, The term he relates to his divine nature, or else he could not have taken the seed of the Woman without original sin.

Thirdly, His office is declared to be a Combater with Satan in his humane nature, as it was accompanied with our true humane affections and passions. And it was declared, that Satan his envious Combater should have his full liberty to do his worst to provoke his patience, to some distemper or other, that so he might spoyl his obedience, and so hinder him from making his soul a Sacrifice, &c. as it is further declared in this Reply.

Good Reader, Let this eminent example of these ingenuous Bereans, make thy spirit calm and deliberate, to search into the blessed Scriptures daily, whether of us have given the right sense, that error may be avoided, and that the truth may be imbraced, and confirmed to thy soul, and to the Church of God, when we are dead and gone.

Thine in the Lord,

W. PYNCHON.

A Postscript.

AFter I had finished my Reply to Mr. *Norton*, and after a good part of it was printed, I received a Book lately published by Mr. *Anthony Burges*, called, *The true Doctrine of Justification, the second Part*, wherein I found that he hath opposed some things in my Book of the *Meretorious Price*; but yet with a differing spirit from Mr. *Norton*, for he professeth that he likes not to be so deep in censuring, as he sees some others are.

1 In page 407. He doth oppose the Dialogue, because it distinguisheth between Christs legal and Mediatorial obedience; But in Chap. 3. and elsewhere, I have justified the said distinction to be sound and good.

2 In page 426. He doth oppose the Dialogue, because it makes the formality of Christs death and sacrifice to be supernatural, and in this point his answer is almost in Mr. *Nortons* expressions, and therefore my Reply in Chap. 17. Sect. 3. and elsewhere, is a sufficient Reply to him as well as it is to Mr. *Norton*.

3 He holds differing things in the point of Christs Satisfaction not only from me, but also from Mr. *Norton*, but I hope my whole Book is a sufficient Reply, and a sufficient vindication of the truth.

4 There is one Scripture in my following Reply, which I have cited to my sense, out of Mr. *Burges* in *Vindiciæ legis*, namely, *Mat.* 5. 17, 18. which he doth now expound in a differing sense from what he had done in *Vindiciæ legis*; namely, That Christ came to fulfil the Law for our righteousness by Gods imputation. This Exposition he did not give in *Vindiciæ legis*, but yet I perceived that he held it to be a truth in it self; but by his former exposition I could not conceive that hee ever intended to hold it from this Text, and Context, or else I had not cited him, and now I would have left him out, had I not been prevented by the Press; for the Exposition that I have now given of

of that Text, in page 173. I believe is the truth, and it hath the approbation of other eminent orthodox Writers; And as for his two Reasons given in page 357. to prove that these words of Christ must bee understood of his Suretiship fulfilling, they prove it not, but according to the Context, they do most fitly agree to Christs Doctrinal fulfilling, as I have expounded that Text. Thus much I thought fit to speak to the Reader.

5 Whereas it hath pleased him to give the term of many Novelisms to my Book: I reply, That every one knows, that when any one doth labour to vindicate the true sense of the blessed Scriptures from some long accustomed errors, that such Expositors will be accounted to hold Novelisms by them that hold such received errors, when our Saviour did vindicate the spiritual sense of the Law in a differing manner from the Scribes in *Mat.* 5. doubtless they censured him for teaching Novelisms, for in *Mark.* 1. 27. they said, *What new doctrine is this?*

But my earnest Request to the advised and deliberate Reader is, To make a thorow search into what both sides say, and then to judge between us; such Readers as these do well deserve the same commendations that *Paul* gave unto the ingenuous *Bereans*: And so resteth,

Thine in the truth of the Gospel,

W. PYNCHON.

A Table of the chief Heads.

But some of these Heads that have this Mark * are not printed, therefore I desire they may be added by the Readers pen, for the better observation of some Points; and because some of them are too much for the Margin; there set onely the first sentence, and make a reference to the rest in the Table to the same page.

CHAP. II.

THE *Covenant of Works made with* Adam, *was not made in relation to his obedience or disobedience to the Moral Law of Nature, as Mr.*Norton *holds, but in relation to his obedience or disobedience to a meer positive symbolical command, about things indifferent in their own nature,* Page 3.

* Add this Note to the Text in pag.16. at the end of ninthly, and in the Margin to p. 118.

The Ceremonial and Judicial Laws (after the time of *Adams* fall) is called the First Covenant (of Works) and these Laws *Moses* wrote in a Book; and thereupon they are called the Book of the Covenant, as *Ainsworth* noteth in *Psal.*25.10. They are called also the first Covenant, in *Heb.*9.1. and 8 7. But the Decalogue was wrote in stone by the finger of God, *Exod.*24.7.2.with ver.12. and with *Heb.*9.19.

* Add this Marginal Note to pag.15.

The outward observation of all the Oeconomy of *Moses*, but especially the outward observation of the Ceremonial Rites, *Paul* calls the Law of Works, (for indeed the outward observation,

tion of them was ordained by Gods Covenant to purifie their bodies, and so to make them fit persons to appear before Gods holy presence in his holy Sanctuary) *Rom.* 3.27. *and* 9.32. and yet these very Laws in their mystical sense, *Paul* doth also call, The Law of Faith, to the spiritual Jews; because in their spiritual use they guided their Faith to trust onely on Christ for Life and Salvation, *Gal.* 3.23. *Rom.* 2.26, 27. And so the divers conditions that belonged to these Laws, did by Gods Ordinance make them to belong unto two differing Covenants, namely, both to the Covenant of Works, and to the Covenant of Grace, contrary to Mr. *Nortons* Tenent, in p. 183, 184.

If Adams *eating of the forbidden fruit had been a sin against the moral Law of Nature, then* Eves *desire to eat had been a sin, before her act of eating,* p. 7

Adam *sinned not in soul, until he had first sinned in body,* p. 8

The command of God for Christ to die, was not from the moral Law as Mr. Norton *holds most erroniously; but it was from a meer voluntary positive Law and Covenant made between the Trinity, as equal and reciprocal Covenanters;* p. 9, 122, 293, 308

* Add this marginal Note to p. 9.

The death of Christ (saith *Grotius*) was not determined by any Law (that was given to man) but by a special Covenant. Cite this also to p. 297. l. 1.

The rectitude of Adams *created nature was such, that he could not will to sin against the moral Law of nature,* p. 10

Adams *ignorance of that positive Law (as of the event) that was at the first given to the Angels (which was to serve man, though in the event many of them refused, and thereby became Devils) made him the more apt to be deceived, by the Devils temptations,* p. 11, 159

Original sin did not fall upon our nature through Adams *disobedience to the moral Law, but through his disobedience to a meer positive Law and Covenant in eating of the forbidden fruit, which was in its own nature but a thing indifferent* p. 13, 34

The moral Law of Nature was not ordained for Adams *justification, but it was ordained onely to be the condition of his created perfections, and therefore it should for ever have been the rule of his life, if he had but been confirmed by his once eating of the Tree of Life in the first place,* p. 14

No act of Adams obedience was ordained to be imputed to his posterity for their obedience, but his first act only in eating of the Tree of Life, because no other act of his obedience, but that alone was constituted by Gods voluntary positive Law and Covenant, to be for the confirmation of his created natural perfections to his posterity, p.14

It was con-natural to Adam to live in the continual practise of moral obedience; therefore that kind of obedience was not ordained for him to merit the confirmation of his created perfections, p.21

* Add these four Sections to the Text in p. 22. just before the Conclusion.

1 The Image of God in *Adam* was no true part of his essence.

2 Neither did it flow from his nature essentially, as the Faculties do from the soul, for then it could not have ceased to be without the destruction of the subject that did support it.

3 Therefore it was but a connexed appendix which the God of Nature con-joyned to his soul and body in his creation (as he con-joyned an admirable beauty to the body of *Moses* at his birth, *Exod.* 2. 2.) which might either continue, or it might be lost by eating some prohibited meat that might cause a distemper, that might cause his beauty to consume as a moth, without the annihilating of his body and soul.

4 The image of God in *Adam* was con-natural to his body, because it should have been transmitted to his posterity by natural generation, if he had but first eaten of the Tree of Life, for the confirmation of his created perfections.

The death threatned in Gen. 2. 17. is limited by two circumstances, to our spiritual death in six onely. Therefore first, That death must needs be the Essential curse that is there threatned. Secondly, therefore it must needs be no less than Blasphemy to affirm, as Mr. Norton *doth that Christ was* Adams *legal surety in the first Covenant, to suffer that cursed death in his room, and place, for his Redemption,* p.24. chap. 16. Rep. 22. at Sixthly,

* Add

* Add this marginal Note to p. 34.

Bodily death was not threatned to be the immediate effect of *Adams* first sin in eating the forbidden fruit, in *Gen.*2.17. neither was a bodily death threatned till after *Adams* fall in *Gen.* 3.19. (which was not until four verses after that God had declared that Christ should be the seed of the woman, &c.) as the proper punishment of *Adams* spiritual death in original sin.

* Add this Note to the Text in p.33. at line 23. and in cha. 16. at Reply 22. *ult.*

If it be granted that God denounced a bodily death, as the immediate effect of *Adams* first sin in eating the forbidden fruit, then the *Pelagians* cannot be convinced that Original sin is the cause of the death of Infants; for then the *Pelagians* might reply, That seeing it is granted that bodily death is the immediate effect of *Adams* first sin, it cannot be the immediate effect of Original sin. But seeing it is evident by *Rom.*5.12. that it is the punishment of Original sin, in Infants, therefore no other death, but a spiritual death in sin, was at the first threatned in *Gen.*2.17.

Original sin is the essential death that God threatned in Gen.2.17. *as the proper fashion of Adams first sin, though in the issue the Elect are redeemed from it by Christs undertaking to be the seed of the conquered woman, and in that nature, (as it was accompanied with our true infirmities) to conquer Satan by his constant obedience to the Laws of the Covenant (notwithstanding Satans unlimited power to provoke, and disturb his patience) and because at last (in the perfection of his said obedience) he made his soul a sacrifice of reconciliation, by breathing out his immortal Spirit, by the own Deifick power.* p.24.63.65

Eternal death in Hell is but an accidental punishment to the first spiritual death in sin p.36

Gods First Covenant with Adam, was not made with Adam as a single person, but it was made with him as he was the head of mans nature to posterity p.35.

The kind of life promised to Adam, and so to all his natural Posterity also, the perpetuity of his life in this world in his created perfections, p.27.

All the glory of Gods Creation had been confounded at the very instant of Adams fall, if God, in his eternal Counsel and Providence, had not ordained Christ to be ready at that instant to take on him the Government of the whole Creation p.28

Gods secret, and not his revealed will, is the inviolable Rule of Gods relative Justice, p.37,35, and ch.15.

CHAP. III.

THe quality or kind of Christs obedience, ex officio, as Mediator, Was not to the moral Law of Nature, as Mr. Norton *affirms, but it was to the voluntary positive Laws of a peculiar voluntary and reciprocal Covenant that was made between the persons in Trinity, from Eternity. Secondly, Though Mr.* Norton *doth one while affirm, That the quality or kind of Christs obedience was legal, the same in nature and measure, which we by the first Covenant stood bound unto, yet another while he doth contradict that, and saith it was more also* p.42.

Christs obedience to the moral Law, is by eminent Divines rightly called Justitiâ personæ; *But his obedience in his death and sufferings they do rightly call,* Justitiâ meriti, p.44

Christs obedience in his incarnation, and in his death, was not his obedience to the moral Law, as Mr. Norton *affirms, but it was a special kind of obedience to the voluntary positive Laws of his Mediatorship onely,* p.45.

* Add this Note to p. 45.

Dr. *Willet* in *Dan.*9. p.291. saith, That Christs Desception, Conception, Incarnation, and his Miracles, are not imputed to us, because they were no part of fulfilling the Law. In these words he doth plainly contradict Mr. *Norton*, for he denies that Christs incarnation was any part of Christs obedience to the moral Law.

If the Incarnation of Christ (which was an act of his God-head) had been an act of obedience to the moral Law, as Mr. Norton *affirms, then his God-head had been in an absolute inferiority to his Father, because the moral Law was given by God as a supreme, which Tenent doth fully maintain the* Arrian *Heresie,* p.47

* Add

* Add this Note to p. 99. and to p. 101.

Mr. *Norton* saith in p. 123. That the Divine nature was angry, not onely with the Humane nature, but with the person of the Mediator, because of sin imputed to him. And in p. 55. he saith, That God charged Christ with sin, as the supream Law-giver, and Judge, &c. In these words he maketh the God-head of the Mediator to be in an absolute inferiority to his Father; which doth also maintain the *Arian* Heresie.

* Add this Note to p. 47. and to p. 51. at 5.

Christ, as he was true man, was under the obligation of the moral Law, and as he was a Jew he was under the obligation of the Ceremonial and Judicial Laws, but as he was Mediator, and as he acted as Mediator, *ex officio*, he was above the moral Law, for he said he was *the Lord of the Sabbath*, even as he was the Son of man. And secondly, he shewed himself to be above the Ceremonial Law, in that he said, *A greater than the Temple is here*, *Matth.* 12. 6, 8.

The Jews legal justifications (under the first Covenant) *by their outward observation of the works of the Ceremonial Law, was a true type of our moral justification by the blood of Christ*, p. 49, 51, 235, and p. 259

CHAP. IV.

THe order of mens legal proceedings in Courts of Judicature is no way suitable to be alledged for an exemplification of the order of Gods proceedings in Christs sufferings (as Mr. Norton saith he) because it appears by Gods Declaration of the Combate in Gen. 3. 15. *that his sufferings (as he was declared to be the seed of the woman) was to be from the voluntary rage in the rish of malitice, with his proclaimed enemy Satan and his Instruments; in which Combate, in case Satan could have prevailed to disturb his patience, then Satan had got the victory, but in case he could not by all his ill usage, disturb his patience, nor any way subvert him in his obedience, then the victory, and the rich prize of mans Redemption was to go on Christs side*, p. 55, 82, 96, 22, & chap. 13. & 14.

Eternity is essential to the Torments of Hell, p. 56

The distinction of essential and circumstantial Hell Torments, thereby

12.

to make Eternity no more but a circumstance, hath four inconveniencies attending it, p.56

Sometimes Mr. Norton *doth affirm that Christ suffered the pain of loss, in respect of the fruition of the good of the Promise, but otherwhiles he saith, it was but in respect of the sense of the good of the Promises; By which wide differing expressions, he leaves the Reader in the dark to grope out his meaning,* p.58

Mr. Norton *in his book* p. 123. *holds, that Christ was separated both in body and soul from all participation of the good of the Promise for a time, and so he comes up to Christs total separation from God for a time,* p.60

Sometimes again he makes the pain of loss, to be no more but the want of the sense of the fauor of God for a time, p.61

Mr. Norton *is put to his shifts to maintain his penal Hell in this life, for he is fain to fly to Gods extraordinary dispensation to maintain it.* p.62

Death in sin is the essential curse that God threatned in Gen. 2. 17. p.62, 68, 34

Seeing the Elect were in Christ virtually, before they were in Adam *actually, it proves that eternal death did not stand in full force against them, but a spiritual death in sin onely,* p.65

Death in sin, and other punishments also, which the Elect do suffer since the revelation of the Covenant of Grace, in Gen. 3. 15. *are* de jure, *penal Justice, though* de facto *(in the issue) they are not,* p.69

* Add this Note to p.69.

Yea Mr. *Norton* himself doth confess in his book p.255. That Original sin is the penal effect of *Adams* sin.

Death is not from God as he did ordain nature, but it was inflicted as a punishment for Original sin, and then he also ordained a judgement to follow, which will be a judgement to eternal death, to all such as die without Faith in their redemption from Satans Head-plot by the promised seed, p.70

Mr. Norton *doth often contradict his foundation Principle, which is, that Christ made satisfaction by suffering the essential punishment of the curse of Hell Torments,* p.72, 107, 113, 29[illegible]

Mr. Norton *doth by necessary consequence impute the sin of unmindful-*

ness to Christ, in the very time when he did execute his Priestly office, p.76 & p.327

* Add this Note to p.76. and to ch. 7. at Sect. 4.

Mr. Vernon in his Portraiture p.248. saith as Mr. Norton doth, That Christ was forgetful of his Office, by reason of the Agony astonishing his senses. O horrible Blasphemy! And though he doth agree with Mr. Norton in the point of imputing sin to Christ, yet he doth contradict Mr. Norton in the point of Christs suffering Hell Torments, for in p. 208. he denies that Christ suffered Hell Torments; because (saith he) some things were unbefitting to the person of Christ, as the torments of Hel, therefore (saith he) the compensation of it was supplied by the worthiness of the person.

Payment in kind doth justifie the Elect actually, as soon as ever they have life in the world. And this Tenent doth justifie the Antinomian Tenent, which holds that the Elect are justified before they have any Faith, p.76

Payment in kind leaves no room for God to exercise his free pardon, p.77 and see *P. Martyr* in Rom. p.381. *ult.*

Mr. Norton affirms, most dangerously, that Christ made full satisfaction by suffering Hell Torments, before his death was completed, and so he makes his death and sacrifice to be altogether vain and needless, as to the point of full satisfaction. p. 79, 309. and chap. 17. Reply 24.

To affirm that Christ suffered the essential Torments of Hell, is all one as to affirm that Christs sufferings were from Gods hatred, p.79. at the fifth Reason, & p.80

The true nature of all Christs greatest sufferings, are described by the word chastisements, in Isa. 53.5. But the essential torments of Hell are no where called chastisements, therefore Christs greatest sufferings cannot truly and properly be called the essential Torments of Hell, p.79 & Reason. & p.169.

CHAP. V.

The Essential Torments of Hell are inflicted from Gods hatred, p.80

CHAP. VI.

Christ undertook all his sufferings from the voluntary Cause and Covenant, and he underwent them as our voluntary combating Surety, for the winning of the prize from his malignant combating Enemy Satan (even the redemption of all the Elect) by continuing constant in his obedience to the Laws of the Combate, even to the death of the Cross; and therefore he did not undergo his suffering from Gods vindicative justice, by imputing the guilt of our sins to him, and so instilling on him the eternal Torments of Hell according to the legal order of justice in Court-proceedings, p. 82, 83, 96, 101, 138, 55. Ch. 13. Ch. 14.

God doth impute the guilt of Adams *first sin to all his natural posterity, because it was his good pleasure (as he was the most absolute-Supreme) to make such a Covenant with* Adam, *as might really include all his natural posterity, namely, That in case he did first eat of the forbidden fruit, then his nature, as it was the fountain of all mans nature in general, should become dead in sin, and so consequently he must impute the guilt of* Adams *first sin to them all, as being all dead in sin by natural generation,* p. 83

Christ could not be Adams *legal Surety to the first Covenant, for then he must have suffered the vindicative curse of death in sin, which is blasphemy in the highest degree to affirm: Therefore none but* Adam *as he was the head of mans nature by natural generation) was under the obligation of punishment for the breach of the first Covenant,* p. 86, 150, 880.

Christ may well be called our voluntary Surety, because he voluntarily undertook our cause, namely, to be our voluntary Combater against Satan to break his Head-plot for our Redemption; but in no sort can he be said to be our legal bounden Surety, in the same obligation with Adam, p. 89, 205

Add this Marginal Note to p. 89.

See also what *Grotius* saith against legal Sureties for life, in capital crimes p. 215, 216.

God ordained all Christs greatest sufferings, in his long passion, to be for his Priestly Consecration, before he could make his death to be a Sacrifice of Reconciliation, p. 362, 369

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

It must needs be but a meer fantasie, to hold that Christ suffered the essential Torments of Hell in this world, seeing Mr. Norton doth acknowledge that the very Divels are not in full Torments, as long as they remain in this world, p. 105

If the humane nature of Christ had partaken of the essential joyes of heaven before his death, (as Mr. Norton holds) then doubtless he had been confirmed against the sufferings of death, p. 107

* Add this Marginal Note to p. 107.

Mr. Rutherford on the Covenant saith in p. 29, 30, 34. that Gods declarative glory is not essential to God.

Mr. Norton doth often fall from his foundation principle (which is, That Christ suffered the essential Torments of Hell) to that which is equivalent, p. 107, 113, 72

The Metaphorical sense of Sheol *and* Hades, *is opened,* p. 108

It is to admiration that Mr. Norton doth interpret the same word in the same Scripture first to signifie Hell-torments; and then secondly, To signifie only the grave, p. 109

* Add this as a Marginal Note to p. 109.

In this Mr. Norton doth contradict his own rule in p. 76. which is, That one, and the same word (especially not being typical) is capable but of one sense in the same place.

The word Psuche, *for soul in the New Testament is most often put for the vital soul,* p. 111, 320

CHAP. VIII.

MR. Norton *doth often leave the point of satisfaction in an uncertainty, because he doth one while affirm, That Christ suffered the essential Curse, and only that; and another while, that he suffered only that which was equivalent,* p. 113, 107, 72, 301

After Adams Fall, outward obedience to the Ceremonial Statutes, and to the Judicial Ordinances, is called the First Covenant

(of works) p. 118, & p. 26
The word Law in Rom. 8. 4. is no proof that Christ kept the moral Law for our righteousness by Gods imputation (as Mr. Norton holds) because it alludes chiefly to the Ceremonial Law, p. 119. & p. 238, 26

* Add this Note to p. 121. l. 2.

The Decalogue was given to fain man as a Covenant of Grace, and therefore it requires spiritual obedience to the Ceremonial and Judicial Laws, as well as to the Moral: *Ainsworth on Num. 6. 12.* saith, One little pollution of the *Nazarite* at unawares, did nullifie many dayes purity; For (saith he) the Law requireth a perfect observation, and curseth him that continueth not in doing all things commanded, *Deut. 27. 26. Gal. 3. 10. Deut. 29. 12. Jo. 2. 10.* But this is to be noted, that if the said Law had not comprehended the Covenant of grace under it, it had not so cursed the non-observers: And saith *Ainsworth* in *Deut 30. 19.* the life which *Moses* set before them was by faith in Christ, &c. And see more what he saith in *D. 27. 6. 1.* and *7. 12.* And see what *Rutherford* (on the Covenant) saith in p. 62. of the better Covenant.

The justice of the Law is sometimes satisfied by payment in kind, and sometimes by that which is equivalent, p. 121, 256, 202, 167, 33

Christ did not make satisfaction by fulfilling the Covenant made with Adam (as Mr. Norton holds.) but by fulfilling another voluntary Covenant that was made between the Persons in Trinity from Eternity, namely, that he should assume the seed of the decreived Woman in personal union, and in that nature as it was accompanied with our true natural infirmities; to combate with Satan for the victory, by continuing constant in his obedience under all Satans ill usage, and that at last in that perfect obedience, he should make his vital soul a sacrifice, and the Father covenanted that his death so performed, should procure his reconciliation to all the Elect, p. 122, p. 9, 130, 162, 167, 55, 96, 182, 183, 256, 308

CHAP. IX.

THe ground of satisfaction, or of that price that merits Gods reconciliation to the Elect, is from the conditions of the voluntary Co-

Covenant, p.130.139.55,82,83,96,102,122,257
Perfect obedience to the Articles of the voluntary Covenant, and Combate, do merit the prize, p.130

* Add this Note to p.130.

When a prize is merited by an exact and righteous observation of the Laws of the Combate, such a prize so obtained, may well be called the Prize (or the Crown) of Righteousness, which the Righteous Judge will give, and cannot deny to the lawful Victor, 2 *Tim.* 4.8. But Christ was such a Righteous Victor in his Combate with Satan, notwithstanding his ill usage to disturb his patience; and therefore the Ancient Divines do often say truly, That Christ conquered Satan by Righteousness, as I have noted some of their speeches, in Ch. 16.

The difference in stating the voluntary Covenant betwixt Mr. Norton *and my self,* p.131

* Add this Note to p. 132.

A Covenant from the voluntary Cause doth never yeeld to be over-ruled by the supreme compulsary Cause (as Mr. Norton holds) as I have often instanced in the Trial of Masteries.

Christ is Gods Mercy-seat in point of Satisfaction, p. 136
Christs Sacrifice, is called a Sacrifice of Attonement, because it doth appease Gods angry face, and procure his Attonement to all poor humbled and beleeving sinners, p.137,191,251,252,259

* Add this Note to p. 137. at *Heb.* 9.14.

Seeing the Altar was a type of the God-head of Christ, the fire of the Altar, must by the like reason be also a type of the God-head of Christ; And therefore when Isaiah cryed out, I am undone, because mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of Hosts, namely, Christ in his glory, as *John* expounds it, *Joh.* 12.41. then saith he, *One of the Zeraphims came flying unto me having a live coal in his hand, which he had taken with the tongs from the Altar, and he laid it upon my mouth, and said, Lo, this hath touched thy lips, and thine iniquity is taken away, and thy sin is purged,* Isa. 6.6,7. or as the *Hebrew* is, thy sin is expiated by Attonement

procured, as Lev. 14. and Rom. 3. 25. this fire was a type of the God-head of Christ, which sanctified the offering, Mat. 23. 19. Heb. 9. 14. 21, 24. for Attonement to his lips.

The end why God declared his justice to be satisfied (in the said obedience of Christ) from his Mercy-seat was first, That he might be just, according to his Covenant made with Christ: And secondly, That he might be just, according to his New Covenant made with the Elect: And thirdly, That he might be the Justifier of believing sinners, p. 139

As the Greek word Dicaios [Just] *is put for one that is pious and merciful, so the Hebrew word* Chesed [Mercy] *is put for one that is pious and just,* p. 141

CHAP. X.

THe death of Christ could not be a penal death from Gen. 2. 17. because God doth threaten none with a penal death, neither in that Text, nor any other, but sinners themselves, p. 145

Add this Note to p. 145.

Rutherford on the Covenant p. 25. saith, You cannot shew me in all the Old or New Testament, any penal Law that was imposed on the Man Christ; where it is written, If the Man Christ sin, he shall eternally dye: I tremble (saith he) at such expressions, and hence I infer, That then Christ could not be *Adams* Surety in the same obligation to the Curse of the first Covenant.

The true nature of Christs death was to be made a sacrifice by the power of his own Priestly office, p. 145, 146, 309, 313, & ch. 17. ult.

Add this Marginal Note to p. 147. at l. 23.

As Christs assumption of flesh and spirit was not like ours, so his death in the formality of it, was not to be like ours, but of a far differing nature.

A description of Christs merit, namely, how he merited our Redemption, p. 148, 176, 130, 308

This speech of Mr. Noctons, Arausius, and the Man Christ dyes,

is but a Paralogism, p.150
Christ was not our surety in the same relation with Adam, p.150,86
Though it is supposed by Mr. Norton *that the first Covenant was made in relation to Adams* [illegible] *Nature, yet in that sense it is not a complete title of God's* [illegible] *Justice,* p.152
Gen.2.17 *doth not comprehend Christ within the compass of it,* p.152

* Add this marginal Note to p.152.

Adam before his fall might beleeve in the Trinity, but yet saith Mr. *Wadams* (in his Portraiture p.98.) he could not beleeve the incarnation of the Second person, for then he should have understood of his own fall, and then consequently (saith he) he would have been in a perpetual fear before his fall. But saith he in p.220. The first *Adam* had not any [illegible] fear, as the second *Adam* had, because there was no hurtful object before his eyes, as there was before the eyes of Christ. And saith *Vindiciæ Legis* in p.129. he needed no Mediator nor comfort because his soul could not be terrified with any sin. And so saith *Austin* in his Enchyrid. to *Laurence* chap.32. When *Adam* was made a right man he needed no Mediator, but when sin did separate him from God, then he must be brought into favor again by a Mediator, &c.

God doth often dispence with his peremptory threatnings, p.157
Gods voluntary positive Laws were not ingraven in Adams nature, as his moral Laws were, no more than the time of the last Judgement was ingraven in the Humane nature of Christ, Mark.13.32. p.159,11
God doth sometimes alter from the Rule of his moral Commands, to the Rule of his secret Decrees, p.160,225

CHAP. XI.

Christ bare our sicknesses, and carried our sorrows from us, not by bearing them upon his own body, as a Porter bears a burden, but he is said to bear them, because he bare them from us by the power of his divine command, p.163

CHAP.

CHAP. XII.

MR. Norton doth most dangerously make all the bodily sufferings of Christ to be hell pains, p.165,169
Mr. Norton doth often wrong the sense of the Dialogue, p.167,296
The true nature of all Christs greatest bodily sufferings are described to be chastisements in Isa. 53.5. therefore they cannot be called the essential torments of Hell, inflicted on him from Gods vindicative wrath, as Mr. Norton calls them, p.169,178,266,311,344
Christs sufferings may justly be called punishments, such as the godly suffer, and yet not proceed from Gods wrath, as their punishments do very often p.171
None of Christs sufferings were inflicted on him from Gods immediate wrath, as Mr. Norton holds, most dangerously, p.172
Christs Humane nature was often purposely left of the Divine nature, not only in his natural and moral actions, that so it might act according to physical causes, but also in his Office, because he was appointed to combate with Satan in his Humane nature, that so he might be the more deeply touched with the sense of our infirmities, p.174 & 383
The true nature of merit described; namely, how Christ did merit our redemption, p.176,130,146,308,256
The Judges imputation of any sin in the voluntary combate, doth cause such a Combater to loose the prize, p.178
Punishments in the voluntary Combate may be suffered from the opposite Champion, without any imputation of sin from Gods vindicative wrath, p.178
God did wound and bruise Christ no otherwise, but as he gave Satan leave to wound him, and to do his worst unto him, p.178,311
All Christs greatest punishments, were suffered without any imputation of sin from God, or else God could not have accepted his death as a propitiatory sacrifice to bring us to God, p.182
Christ was eminently voluntary and active in complying with all his sufferings from his Combater Satan, or else they had not been meritorious, p.183

CHAP.

CHAP. XIII.

The word [Sin] is often used in a metaphorical sense, for a sin-sacrifice, because it was offered to procure Gods Atonement for sin, p.190

Christ attoned his Fathers wrath with the sacrifice of his body and blood, p.192

It is evident by Isa.53.6. *and by* Jer.30.21. *that there passed a Covenant between the Trinity from eternity for mans Redemption,* p.193

Christ put away sin, as the phrase is, in Heb.9.26. *or condemned sin, as the phrase is, in* Rom 8.3. *when he abolished the use of all sin(offerings) by his only true sacrifice for our sins,* p.196

The imposition of hands upon the head of the condemned person by the witnesses, was to testifie their faith to the throwers of stones, that the evidence they had given in against him was true, p.198

Christ doth still bear our sins in Heaven, as much by Gods imputation, as ever he bare them when he lived here upon earth, p.204

* Add this Note to p.205.l.20.

All such as hold that Christ was our bounden Surety in the same obligation with *Adam*, must hold as *Mr. Norton* doth in p.239. that Christ was delivered from his act of Surety-ship at his death: But all such as hold him to be no other Surety, but as he is our voluntary Priest to intercede for the pardon of sin, must hold him to be an eternal Surety, as they hold him to be an eternal priest, and that he was not discharged of his Suretiship at his death, but that he doth still continue to be our Mediatorial Surety, for the procuring of Gods daily pardon as long as we live in this world, p.205,89.

CHAP. XIV.

MR. Nortons palpable mistaking of the Righteousness of God, to mean nothing else but the Righteousness of Christ in 2 Cor.5.21. *is one main cause of his erroneous Interpreta-*

tion, p.208
It is the righteousness of each person in Trinity to perform their Covenants to each other, for the orderly working out of a sinners Reconciliation and Justification, p.211
No Scripture rightly interpreted doth make our sins to be formally imputed to Christ, namely, not by Gods legal imputation, as Mr. Norton holds, p.212
Mount Law doth not allow Sureties for capital crimes, p.216.
The imputation of our sins to Christ, as it is asserted by Mr. Norton, is a doctrine but of late dates, p.222
Christ did impute our sins to himself, to make himself a guilty sinner, as much as ever his father did, [illegible]

SECT. 4.

Gods forgiveness is the formal cause of a sinners righteousness, p.228

* Add this Note to p.231. at *Rom.* 3.26. in line 15.

And further saith *P. Martyr* on the *Romans*, p.318. as *differentia* maketh the nature or kind, so the righteousness of God maketh our Justification, for when we are by him absolved from sin we are justified. And saith he in p.367.B. God justifieth in absolving us from our sins, and ascribing and imputing to us righteousness: and saith he, this word *Hitsedik*, is a word taken of the Law, and appertaineth to Judgements, and so to justifie, is by judgement. And saith he, forasmuch as there are two significations of this word Justifie; namely, either indeed, or in account and estimation (for God is the Author of either of them) whether of these two shall we follow in the point of Justification proposed? Forsooth (saith he) the latter, (namely, that God doth justifie by account and estimation) and this, I suppose, (saith he) is sufficient touching the declaration of this word Justification: And, saith he, the answer of the Council of *Trent* in p.388.b. The formal cause is the Justice of God, not that Justice whereby he himself is just, but that which he communicateth to us, whereby we are truly both counted just, and also are so indeed; For *Paul* sufficiently that Justification doth consist herein, that our sins are forgiven us, and that they are no more imputed to us. And saith he, in p.410

The

The disputation is not about any Righteousnes that cleaveth unto us, but about Justification, which is the forgiveness of sins. But this Righteousnes (saith he) hath no place or seat in our minds, but in God onely, by whose will onely our sins are forgiven us. These speeches taken from him on the 10 and 11 chap. of the *Romans*, must needs be his last and most refined expressions of the Formal cause; and he doth also apply the Imputation of Christs Righteousnes to the meritorious cause, as I apprehend, by comparing his whole doctr together, or else he should cross his said definition of the Righteousnes of God.

Reconciliation hath two parts, namely, Justification and Adoption; or thus, Gods gracious pardon is the whole of Reconciliation, p.233, 234 p.Hh at 3. and in p.253

Sacrifices of Atonement and washings from legal uncleanness, were ordained for their outward ceremonial Justification from their ceremonial sins under the first Covenant; and so it was a lively type of the true justification in Gods sight, under the New Covenant, p.253

Add this Note to p.239. at 5.

Dicaioma was used by the Seventy for the Jews outward justification in observing their judicial Laws, as well as of their ceremonial Rites; And so also this word *Dicaioma* is applyed to the Heathen Judicials in *Rom.*1.32. And saith Dr. *Willet* on that verse, this word *Dicaioma* is not there meant of the moral Law (as some Interpreters do expound it) but of the judicial Laws of the Heathens: and again it is sometimes applied as a proper word to denote either their judicial Laws, or their religious (though Idolatrous) Rites, as in 1 *Macc.*1.43,51, and 2 *Macc.* 2.21.

The Jews (after their Prophets ceased) abused the use of their typical and ceremonial Justifications by the works of the first Covenant, to claim thereby an eternal justification in Gods sight, p.245

The material cause of Justification disputed and explained, p.248

Reconciliation or Attonement described, both in the meritorious and formal causes, p.251,252,255,137,198

* Add this Note to p.252.

Mr. *Ainsworth* in *Lev.*8.30. (and in other places also) doth agree with the Dialogue, in making Attonement to be a term *Synonima* to justification (in the formal cause of it) and so doth *Peter Martyr* often, as in *Rom.* p.228. Herein (saith he) consisteth our justification to have our sins forgiven us, and to bee reconciled to God; And so *Calvin* speaks often, as in *Inst.* l.3. c.11. *sect.*11. They (saith he) be judged righteous, that be reconciled to God; the manner how is declared, for that God justifieth by forgiving; And (saith he) in c. 14 *sect.*17. to touch it by the way, this righteousness standeth of reconciliation: And, saith *Tindal* in his Prologue to *Rom.* by justifying (saith he) understand no other thing then to be reconciled to God, and to be restored into his favour, and to have thy sins forgiven thee, &c. These and sundry others do accord with the Dialogue, that Reconciliation (which is the same with Attonement) is the formal part of justification.

Price, That only ought to be called the full price of mans Redemption that was constituted to be accepted of grace as the full and formal price by Gods voluntary positive Covenant, p.256,221,267,77,202

* Add this Note to p.259. at the word *Capher* (and also to p.285.)

Gods Atonement procured, is said to sanctifie the sinner, because it did justifie him from the guilt of all his sins, and so the word Sanctified must be understood in *Act.*26.18. of being made extrinsecally sanctified, as it is in *Heb.*10.10,14. and so the word purified in *Act.*15.9. must be understood of their being purified from the guilt of their sins, or of their being made righteous by justification, as *Peter Martyr* on the *Rom.*p. 392. and others do explain it; for this Text is an answer to the question touching the necessity of Circumcision, and of their other legal purifyings; for the false Apostles esteemed the believing Gentiles to be unclean, unless they did observe their legal purifyings, *Act.*10, 14, 15, 24, 28. so likewise the word Cleansed in 1 *Joh.*1.7. and in *Tit.*2.14. is put for their being cleansed from the guilt of their sins by Gods Attonement, or for their being justified, and not for their inherent sanctity (though

(though it is also true that none are justified, or made extrinsecally righteous and holy by Gods Attonement until they be first inherently sanctified). *Peter Martyr* in *Rom.* 1. 6, 7. on these words, Called to be Saints, saith, If we will search out the strength of the signification of the word *Sancti*, that is, Saints or holy; It cometh (saith he) as *Austin* teacheth, of this word *Sanctio*, to Constitute; for that (saith he) is called Holy, which is constant and firm, and appointed to abide; but nothing (saith he) doth more let us to abide for ever, than doth sin, therefore it cometh to pass that holiness consisteth chiefly in the forgiveness and remission of sins; and this exposition (in the same page) he doth also apply to our being sanctified by justification in 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. but this kind of justifying holiness by Gods Attonement and forgiveness, which makes a sinner to abide for ever righteous, just, and holy in Gods sight, *Mr. Norton* doth damn for heresie; And in p. 228. he calls this Attonement and forgiveness, A pestilent fiction and abomination: O blindness (and blasphemy) extream in the typical sense, and use of the legal word Sanctified; purged, cleansed, purified, made righteous and justified! was the *Jews* a holy Nation by inherent righteousness, or rather was it not because of their constant practise to make themselves holy, according to the first Covenant by their typical holiness?

CHAP. XV.

THe outward manner of Christs death in being crucified on a Tree, was first declared in Gen. 3. 15. *by this phrase*, Thou shalt peirce him in the Foot-soals, p. 263

Stoning to death, and hanging up of the dead body on a Tree to be gazed on for a further infamy after his stoning to death, was accounted to be the most accursed of all kinds of death, because of the infamy that was contracted by hanging after he was stoned to death, p. 268

* Add this Note to p. 268.

When the *Jews* had killed the ten sons of *Haman* on the thirteenth day of *Adar*, then *Ester* requested the King that their dead bodies might be hanged on a Gallows all the fourteenth

day for their greater infamy, reproach and curse, in relation both to *Hamans* execrable plot, and also to Gods ancient curse upon the *Amalekites*, for they came of the stock of the *Amalekites* that God had eminently cursed, *Exod.* 9.12,13,14. *Exod.* 17.16. 1 *Sam.*15.

The time of the burial of the person hanged, might be done after Sunset, provided it were done within the compass of the same natural day, which lasted till midnight, p.272

The latter Editions of King James's *Translation on* Deut.21.23. *is corrupted from the integrity of the first Editions,* p. 273

The true reason why he that was hanged must be buried the same day, in which he was stoned to death, was, because his curse of infamy by hanging so long on a Tree by exemplary Justice, had appeased Gods anger, and so consequently, because it had now removed the curse that else would have fallen on the land, p. 275

The whole land might be defiled by the Judges negligence, in suffering notorious sinners to go unpunished, p.277

The whole land was never defiled by any one Ceremonial sin, p. 279

The rule of Gods relative Justice, is his secret will, which is sometimes contrary to his revealed Will, p.281,37,100,183

The second death is defined by the Hebrew *Doctors (from whom that term is borrowed) to be a misery to the soul in the perpetual hatred of God,* p.286

All sorts of death that men do suffer in this world, that is to say, both our spiritual death in original sin, and our bodily death, are altogether called and accounted (both by ancient and later Divines) the first death, in relation to the term second death, because that is only suffered in the world to come, p.287

Mr. Norton *doth sometimes hold satisfaction to be made by Christs suffering the essential curse of Hell-torments in kind, but at other times he doth hold an alteration to equivalency,* p. 291, 72, 107, 113.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVI.

Christ did fear death regularly more than other men can do, because his pure nature was not made subject to death by that curse in Gen. 3.19. *as the nature of all other men is.* p.293

Christ did first effect his Combate with Satan in his human nature, and then he did effect his sacrifice (by his Priestly power) in both his natures; and all this according to his Covenant, and therefore he was not made subject to death by Gods curse as ours is, p.293,297, 308, and p.9

The excellent temper, and tender constitution of Christs humane nature, made him more sensible of shame, fear and pain, than other men can be, p.294

Christ feared his ignominious death, after the rule of fear, and not after the example of this, or that man. p.295

Christs death was not a natural, but a supernatural death. p.296,333

* Add this Note to p. 297, at line 1. and also to p.9. and p.293.

The death of Christ was effected according to the Articles of the Covenant between the Father and the Son.

* Add this Marginal Note to p.298.

Christ did not pray to escape death, but only that his humane nature might bee confirmed against his natural fear of death, and so saith *Trap, Heb.*5.7. hee was heard in that hee feared, that is (saith he) he was delivered from his fear, for no sooner had he prayed, but he met his enemies, and said, *whom seek yee, I am he,* p.298.

Christ did voluntarily take our passions to him, as they were a punishment inflicted on mankind for Adams *sin,* p.300

Christ had natural fear actually, which the first Adam *had not, because there was no hurtful object before his eyes, as there was before the eyes of Christ,* p.300,152

If there be any Martyrs, to whom it is pleasant to dye, that they have from otherwhere, and not from the nature of death, p.301

When

When the pains of death have astonished sanctified reason, then no man can express what conflict there is between their nature and death, the destroyer thereof, which conflict was not in Christ. p.302

Mr. Norton *doth in* p.153. *most dangerously affirm, That Christ suffered a twofold death, namely, not only a bodily death, but also that God inflicted a spiritual death upon his immortal soul, which he doth also affirm to be the second death.* p.307.315

The only reason why the death of Christ was a death of satisfaction distinct from Martyrdome, was the Covenant between the Trinity, p.308,9,122,130

All the sufferings of Christ were as necessary to his sacrifice, as the consecration of the Priest, was to his sacrifice. p.309

The Sacrifice of Christ, doth properly lye in the formality of his death, which himself effected by his own Priestly power, namely, by the actual power, and joynt concurrence of both his natures, p.309 313,145

God did all the external sufferings of Christ, by giving license to Satan and his instruments to do them, and God did all Christs internal soul-sufferings by appointing Christ to assume our true humane nature and affections, and to use them at his own will and pleasure, more or less, as objects did present, p.312,178. & Ch.17

There is a sympathy between soul and body in sufferings, p.313

The sufferings of Christs soul in Matth.26. 38. *and in* Isaiah 53.10. *must be understood chiefly of Christs vital soul, and not of his immortal soul,* p.314

Satisfaction was made by the true bodily death of Christ; and not by his spiritual death, as Mr. Norton *doth affirm most dangerously,* p.315,307

A true description of the vital soul, and so consequently of the death of Christs vital soul (but not of his immortal soul) for our Redemption p.320

A true description of our natural fear of death, p.321

Christs soul-sorrows could not be lethal and deadly (as Mr. Norton *doth affirm most dangerously) because they were governed by right reason,* p.322

* Add

Add this Note to p. 322.

Disorderly and irregular fear and grief, doth sometimes prove lethal and deadly; but it is dangerous to affirm the same of Christs regular fear and grief. I find it recorded in the *French* Academy, p. 34. That *Herennius* the *Sycilian* dyed with fear, for, he being found to be a Co-partner in the conspiracy of *Caius Gracchus*, was so astonished and oppressed with fear in consideration of his judgement yet to come, that he fell down stark dead at the entry of the prison: And it is also recorded, that *Plaminius* dyed of grief, for upon the sight of his dead wife, he took it so to heart, that he cast himself upon her dead body, and was there stifled with sorrow and grief. But it is most dangerous to make Christs soul-sorrows to be lethal and deadly after this manner; for saith *Damascen*, His passions never prevented his (regular) will; neither might his death be effected by natural causes, but by his own Priestly power, or else it could not be a Sacrifice.

Christ was not fully amazed in his Agony, p. 323
By consequence, Mr. Norton *doth impute the sin of unmindfulness to Christ, even in the very point of time when he was in the execution of his Priestly office*, p. 327, 76
Mr. Norton *stretcheth the word* (very heavy) *in* Mark. 14. 33. *beyond the Context*, p. 328
Luke 22. 44. *and Christs Agony explained*, p. 331
Natural death is the punishment of original sin; but Christs humane nature was not by that Justice subjected to death, p. 333, 296
Ainsworth, *and others, do make the earnest prayers of Christ in the Garden, to be a cause, in part, of his Agony*, p. 334

* Fervency of spirit in prayer, to be delivered from a natural fear and dread of an ignominious death, may force out a bloody sweat, p. 335.

A true description of Christs Agony, p. 336

* A Declaration of the Plot of the blessed Trinity for mans Redemption, p.341. at line 18.

All Christs greatest outward sufferings were by Gods appointment to be from his Combater Satan, p.344,169,178,266,321,387

Satan did first enter the Lists with Christ at his Baptism, when he was first extrinsecally installed into the Mediators office, though more effectually in the Garden, and on the Cross, p.346

Christ did not enter the Lists with Satan in the glorious power of his divine nature, but in his humane nature, as it was accompanied with our true natural infirmities of sorrow and fear at his approaching igneminious death, p.353

Some expressions of the Ancient Divines do elderly evidence, that they could not hold any such imputation of sin to Christ as Mr. Norton *doth,* p.356

* Some few of the *Hebrew* Doctors writings (yet extant) do speak of the sufferings of Christ from Satans enmity, p.357. at line 16.

Adams first sin, in eating the forbidden fruit, was the meritorious cause of our spiritual death in sin, and then our spiritual death in sin was the meritorious cause of Gods justice, first, in denouncing our bodily death, and secondly, in denouncing a judgement to follow, to each departed soul, p.357

The Pelagians *cannot be convinced, That original sin is the cause of the death of Infants, if it be granted, that God threatned a bodily death in* Gen. 2.17. *as the immediate effect of* Adams *first sin,* p.358

Christ, as man, was not able to conflict with his Fathers wrath, though in that nature he was able to conflict with Satan, and his instruments, p.359

If it be true that Christ sweat clods of blood (as Mr. Norton *doth affirm) then it must needs be a miraculous sweat, and then no natural reason can be given as the cause of it,* p.361.

CHAP. XVII.

THe Hebrew word Azab *hath not two contrary significations, as Mr.* Norton *doth affirm, to amuse his Reader about the manner of Gods forsaking Christ upon the Cross,* p. 371

All Christs greatest sufferings are comprised under the word Substitutement, p.375,169

Our larger Annotation on Psal. 22. 1. doth accuse Mr. Nortons way of satisfaction to be but bare humane Ratiocination, which (saith the Annotation) is but meer folly and madness, p.377

God forsook Christ on the Cross, because he did not then protect him against the Powers of darkness, as he had done very often in former times, p.379

One main reason why God forsook the Humane nature of Christ upon the cross, was, that so his Humane nature might be the more tenderly touched with the feeling of our infirmities, in all the afflictions that were written of him. p.383,174

The Humane nature was no true part of the divine person, but an appendix onely, p.387

* Add this Note to the marginal Note in p.387.

Zanchy, in his sixth and seventh Aphorisms to the confession of his faith, p.280. saith, That the Humane nature was no true part of the person of Christ; and saith he in his twelfth Aphorism, at 4. Though the nature taken (to speak properly) is not a part of his person, yet at 5. he saith, It is acknowledged to be as it were a part of the person of Christ, because without it we cannot define what Christ is, and because of them both, there is but one and the same Hypostasie.

Though the Humane nature of Christ ever had its dependance and subsistence in the divine, after the union; yet such was the singleness and the unmixedness of the divine nature in this union, that it could leave the Humane nature to all of it self, according to its own natural principles, p.388

* Add this Note to p.389. at line 6.

In two things, saith *Parem*, this similitude of *Athanasius* doth not agree; and before him *Zanchy* said as much, for in his sixth Aphorism he saith, It is freely confessed by *Justinus*, and by other Fathers, that this similitude doth not agree

in all things to this great mystery.

* The *Geneva* Annotation on *Psal.* 22.1. doth say, That Christ was in a horrible conflict between Faith and Desperation; and so by necessary consequence, it makes Christ to be a true inherent sinner; and this blasphemous Note hath been printed and dispersed in many thousand copies, and yet where is the *Boanerges* to be found that hath vindicated Christ from this dangerous Tenent? p.393.

God did not so forsake the soul of Christ on the cross, as to deprive him of the sweet sense of the good of the Promises, as Mr. Norton *holds most dangerously,* p.394

Christ was often his owne voluntary afflicter with Soul-sorrows, p.404,178.

Christ was the onely Priest in the formality of his own death and sacrifice; But yet it doth not thence follow, that he was his own Executioner, or Self-murderer, as Mr. Norton *doth most unadvisedly thence infer,* p.405

No full satisfaction could be made by any thing that Christ suffered, before his bodily death was compleated, because therein onely lay the formality of his sacrifice, without which no full satisfaction could be made, p.415,309,79,145,315

Sometimes Mr. Norton *doth make Christ to die formally under the sense of the wrath of God for full satisfaction; but at other times he doth cross that, and makes satisfaction to be fully compleated before hee suffered his natural death; So uncertain hee is in his foundation-Principles touching Christs satisfaction,* p.416

There was a transcendent difference between the manner of Peters laying down his life for Christ, and the manner of Christs laying down his life, as a sacrifice, for the redemption of the Elect, p.417

* Add this Note to p.417.

Mr. *Weams* on the Judicial Laws, p.78. doth observe, that though *Peter* said to Christ in *Joh.* 13.37. *Lord, I will lay down my life for thy sake,* yet Christ (that knew his naturall unwillingnes

nesse better then himselfe) told him afterwards, *that another shall carry thee whither thou wouldest not*; so that in the conclusion, when *Peter* came indeed to dye for Christ, he was partly willing, and partly unwilling, *Joh.21.18.* which kind of unwillingnesse was not in Christ at his death, because he had by his prayers in the Garden obtained a confirmation against his naturall fear of death, when hee came to dye on the crosse. Therefore Mr. *Norton* doth deale very unsatisfiedly to compare the manner of *Peters* laying downe his life, with the manner of Christs laying downe his life for the Elect.

* Add this Note also to p.417.

The power which Christ said he had to lay down his life, must not be understood of a permissive power, to let Satan take it away formally, nor yet of his absolute power as he was God, but of his derivative power in relation to his Office of Mediatorship, as I noted it in pag.46. and in p. 420. from Mr. *Ball*; for his Fathers commandement or commission gave him a speciall power of lawfull authority to lay down his life, and therefore in *vers.* 18. he saith, this commandement, or this authority have I (as Mediator) received of my Father.

Christs Priestly consecration by his sufferings, and his Sacrifice, by the formality of his death, must not be confounded, but distinguished, when the parts of his Priestly Office are explained, p.427

No other all of a Priest doth make a Sacrifice formally, but such an act as God hath appointed for the taking away of the life of the sacrifice formally, p.429,408,416,309,315,345.

The word Sanctifie, *or* make Holy, *in the Law, is frequently ascribed to Gods Attonement and Forgivenesse procured by Sacrifice; And therefore all those sinners that are made holy by that means, are Justified, and Righteous persons in Gods sight,* p.431

These three legall Phrases, Pardon of Sin, Gods Attonement, and

and a Sinners Righteousness, are the same thing, quite contrary to Mr. Norton's long Discourse, in p. 209, 210, 211, 212, &c. See p. 432.

What other death can the Apostle mean did God ordain to Reconcile us to himself, but by the death of Christs flesh? and not by the spiritual death of his immortall Soul, as Mr. Norton holds? p. 434.

The death of Christ, as it was a sacrifice of Reconciliation, was by Gods voluntary Covenant, the full price of mans Redemption, p. 436.

A

A Table of some Scriptures that are Expounded or Illustrated.

Genesis.

Ch.	Verf.	Page.
2	7	4.
2	9	4,154.
2	17	23,59,63,112,130, 144,149,152.
3	15	82, 89, 91, 96, 124, 135, 142, 167, 171, 176, 178, 263, 269, 297, 308, 310, 324, 332, 341, 344, 348, 400, 418.
3	19	30, 147, 334, 401, 419.
20	3	158
32	20	137, 191, 251, 252, 257.

Exodus.

Ch.	Verf.	Page.
21	31	235, 432.
23	5	271
24	7,8	119
29	36,37	190, 432
30	10	251
30	12	135, 255, 436
30	16	256, 436
32	10	335.
32	27,29	92.
32	32	181

Leviticus.

Ch.	Verf.	Page.
1	4	133.
4	20	233.
6	26	213.
6	30	233
7	15	272.
10	17	194
11	44	432
15	31	50, 148, 234
16	30	433
17	4	87
17	11	315, 318, 320
18	5	17.
20	15	216. To this Text see our larger Annotation on the word *cursed*, in *Gen.* 3.14.

Numbers.

Ch.	Verf.	Page.
5	8	251
14	19	233
19	11,15	280, 282.

Ch.	Verſ.	Page.
25	4	268, 275
35	25	319
	Deuteronomy.	
6	24,25	239
9	14	335
21	8	233, 257
21	23	262
27	26	119, 151
29	12	119
33	19	233, 252
	Joſhua.	
7	12	276
8	29	272
	2 Samuel.	
21	1	280
21	9	276
22	5	327
	1 Kings.	
21	3	113, 131, 256
	2 Kings.	
20	1	157
	2 Chron.	
36	19,20	158
	Job.	
1	21	179, 348
2	7	ibid.
19	21	ibid.
36	32	189
42	8	258

Ch.	Verſ.	Page.
	Pſalms.	
16	10	109
18	5	321, 327
22	1	59, 370
25	11	333
25	18	168
31	5	436
32	1	168, 258, 260
32	5	85
40	6	213
40	8	44, 187
40	16	370
49	7,8,9	94, 135
51	14	233
51	19	233, 252
65	4	137
69	7,9	269
69	20	343
69	27	349
78	38	160
94	15	138
118	19	49
	Proverbs.	
7	9	272
28	13	197
	Iſay.	
53	4	162
	5	166, 178, 181, 266, 349, 375
	6	167, 186, 193
	7	181, 184
	8	351
	9	351
	10.	96, 124, 178, 211, 222, 223, 314, 348.

Ch.	Vers.	Page.
	12	188,220,337,344, 378,399.
		Jeremy.
30	21	187
32	8	59
		Ezekiel.
18	4,20	25,94,149,227,
27	12,13,14	373
		Daniel.
6	14	224.
6	14.	340
6	21,23	429
8	14.	49,235,260
9	7,16	233
9	24,27	48,139,196,223, 233, & 233, 241, 250,260
9	26	223,352
		Jonah.
3.	4	158.
		Zachery.
13	1	190
13	7	347
		Matthew.
4	1	346
5	17,18	113
16	21	142
19	28	29
20	22,23	305
26	28	260
	31	346
	38	173,269,270,298

Ch.	Vers.	Page.
		318,321, 327.
	39	9,46,305
	46	335,339
	47	347
	53,54	184,298,384
27	39	270
	45	179.
	46	159,370
		Mark.
10	39	305,307
14	33	283,338.
14	24,35	290.
15	27,28	220,352
		Luke.
9	28	107
9	31	101.
10	40	374.
12	50	183.
22	28	170
	41	100,177,331,334, 336, 338.
	53	184,418
23	34	45
23	46	436,414.
24	25,26,44	143
24	46	95
		John.
10	11	181,344
10	15	181,314
10	17,18	46,298,314,369, 409,418,426
11	33	337,417
12	27	337,404
14	30,31	184,346,352
16	32	61
18	4,6	184
18	11	179,298

Ch.	verſ.	Page.
19	11	179,351
ib.	28	75,328
ib.	30	75,90
ib.	33	415

Acts.

2	23	179,312,351
ib.	27	109
3	17,18	142
4	28	179
13	27,28	143
15	9	239, in the Manuſc. Note

Romans.

1	32	239
2	13	18
ib.	26	241,260
3	21	223,237
ib.	25	136,233,258
ib.	26	134,140,180,228
ib.	27	15,244
ib.	31	125
4		88
ib.	25	312
5	9,10	229
ib.	12	31
ib.	14	31 153
ib.	16	240, and ſo it is tranſlated juſtified in *Syracides* 24,20.
ib.	18	135,211,228,233 240
ib.	19	86,153,211,233 343
8	3	49,226 237, and ſee the Dialogu p.116
ib.	4	119,237,238,260
ib.	23	39
ib.	32	95,179,312,350
9	31	244
10	3	138,232,237
ib.	4	248
15	30	335

1 Corinth.

1	24,25	424
6	11	237,259,260
ib.	20	256
9	24	178,340
15	29	306
ib.	50,53	89

2 Corinth.

5	21	207
13	4	423
3	13	262
ib.	16	342
4	4,5	47
5	11	270

Philippians.

1	30	340
2	6	232,239
ib.	8,9	124,344
ib.	9,10,11	277
3	9	120, 123, 233 Twice
ib.	10,11	370
4	3	340

Ch.	Verſ.	Page.
	Coloſſians.	
1	21,22	434
ib.	29	340
2	14,15	124, 146, 344, 234, 419
	1 Tim.	
2	6	256
4	10	340
	2 Tim.	
2	5	178
4	7,8	178,340
	Titus.	
2	14	p.50,259
	Philemon.	
v.18		87,219, and ſee *Peter Martyrs* Com.pl. part.p.4.263.
	Hebrews.	
1	3	p.252
2	10,17	90. 92, 93, 344, 386, 427, 430
ib.	14	90,294,357,419
ib.	17,18	165,170,194
4	16	136,140
5	6	169,
ib.	7	299, 303, 334, 336
7	22	115,118
ib.	21	426
ib.	28	90
8	3	430
ib.	12	139, 233, 258
9	1 10	49,118,235,260
ib.	13	48, 51, 120, 214 235, 260, 432
ib.	14	90,137,214,433
ib.	15,16	90,137,181 420 418
ib.	18,23	120
ib.	22	124
ib.	24	196
ib.	26	49 195
ib.	27,28	147,358
10	4	433
ib.	5	294
ib.	7	43
ib.	10	46,122,124,837 259
ib.	32	340
12	2	146, 178, 269, 339
13	13	270
	1 Peter	
1	19,20	132,256
2	24	103,181
3	18	184
	1 John.	
1	7	50 259
ib.	9	133,180
	Rev.	
5	9,12	428

Ch.	Verſ.	Page.
2	14	142
	15	143
	16	144
	17	145
	18	146
	19	147

Christs Satisfaction Discussed and Explained.

CHAP. I.

Touching the nature of Christs Satisfaction.

Mr. Norton's *first Proposition is this.*

The Lord Jesus Christ as God-man, Mediator, according to the will of his Father, and his own voluntary consent, obeyed the Law, doing the Command in a way of Works, and suffering the Essential punishment of the curse in a way of obedient satisfaction unto Divine Justice; thereby exactly fulfilling the first Covenant; which active and passive obedience of his, together with his original Righteousnesse, as a Surety, God of his rich grace actually imputeth to beleeving Sinners for their Righteousnesse.

Reply. I deny several things in this Proposition to be true: But because all the particulars are but barely affirmed here, though some proofs are hereafter alledged; therefore I shall defer my Reply to the particulars to the places where I shall find them repeated, with their proofs annexed.

In the mean time the Reader may please to take notice:

That I deny first, That Christ made any such Covenant by his

voluntary consent with his Father, as to be bound in the same obligation with *Adam* to fulfill the first Covenant in a way of satisfaction.

Secondly, That the first Covenant made with *Adam*, was not touching his obedience or disobedience to the Moral Law; but it was touching his obedience or disobedience to a positive Law about things indifferent in their own nature.

CHAP. II.

And first the true Nature of the first Covenant is Discussed.

SECTION I.

Where also *Mr. Norton's* second Proposition is examined, which is this.

GOD in the First Covenant (the substance whereof is, Do this and thou shalt live, Lev. 18. 5. But in the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt dye, Gen. 2. 17.) proceeded with man in a way of Justice.

Mr. Norton proves by these two Scriptures, that the nature of the first Covenant made with *Adam*, was in relation to his obedience and disobedience to the Moral Law of Nature; and he doth make great account of both these Scriptures, because he cites them very often to that sense.

And in *Page* 186. He affirms that God propounded the Law of Works to man before his fall, with the promise of justification and life, in case of Legal obedience.

And in *Page* 180. He saith, That the summe of this Law in the two Tables (and which he) is called the Law of Works, in Rom. 3. 27. because it required perfect obedience to life, Lev. 18. 5. And this Law, he calls Moral, positive, the habitual writing whereof in our hearts by nature, together with its

for obligation, were both from the first instant of the Creation; this binds perpetually, and it is immutable.

And in Page 190. he saith, The Transgression then of Adam in eating the forbidden fruit was a breach of the said Law of Works, which was given to Adam, and afterwards to Moses.

Reply 1. In opposition to Mr. *Norton's* description of the nature of the first Covenant, I shall labour to prove that the true nature of the first Covenant, was in relation to *Adams* obedience or disobedience to a positive Law, about things indifferent in their own nature, and not about the Moral Law of nature.

My first Reason is this:

If God made a Covenant with *Adam*, concerning his obedience or disobedience about his eating of the two Trees; the one called the Tree of Life, and the other the Tree of Knowledge of good and evil, (which was indifferent to be eaten, or not eaten in their own nature) then the first Covenant was not made concerning his obedience or disobedience to the Moral Law of Nature; unless Mr. *Norton* will affirm that God made two Covenants of works with *Adam* in his innocency, of a differing nature, the one of positive, and the other of moral Commands.

The first Covenant was not made in relation to *Adams* obedience or disobedience to the Moral law of nature, but in relation to his obedience or disobedience to a positive Command about things indifferent in their own nature.

But it is absurd to affirm, that God made two Covenants of works with *Adam* of such a differing nature.

Therefore one of the two must needs be null; But the Covenant concerning the two Trees cannot be null; because that Covenant is expressed in the Text; therefore hence it follows that the moral Law of nature was not propounded to *Adam* as the first Covenant of works, with the promise of justification and life in case of legal obedience, as Mr. *Norton* affirmeth upon Scriptures mis-interpreted; and on this sandy foundation he builds the greatest part of his Answer to the Dialogue.

The first Covenant was made with *Adam* concerning mans nature in general (as he was the head of all mankind) and that Covenant was this, Eat of the Tree of life in the first place (for I have ordained it as thou mayest perceive by the name given

to it) for the confirmation of thy created natural perfections to thee, and to all thy seed for ever, as these places conferred together do prove, *Gen.* 1.29. *Gen.* 2.9, *Gen.* 3.2, *Gen.* 3.22. and as I have also expounded in my Book of the Institution of the Sabbath: And saith *Christopher Carlile*, where you have this Hebrew word *Cajim* in the dual Number, it signifieth Immortality, as (*Gnets Cajim*) the Tree of Lives, of which (saith he) if *Adam* had tasted it would have brought Immortality; and so when [*Neshamah*] hath *Casjm* joyned to it, it signifies the soul is immortal, in *Gen.* 2.7.

In his descent into Hell, p. 163. & 172.

Secondly, Though this promise is not altogether so plainly expressed in the Text as the Threatning is; yet seeing the Threatning (*In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely dye*) is expressed plainly as the reward of his disobedient eating: it follows by consequent, saith Mr. *Burges*, that some good thing is promised to obedience: And what else (say I) can that good thing be, but the confirmation of his present mutable created perfections by his obedient eating of the Tree of life? for in case he had but first eaten of that Tree, that once eating should by Gods Covenant have confirmed his nature in his present created perfections to him, and to all his posterity for ever.

See *Vindiciæ legis lect.* 13. p. 123. & *Vindiciæ Fœderis*, p. 9. And Mr. *Ball* on the Covenant p. 6. 8.

Thirdly, saith Mr. *Ball*, the Lord having respect to the immutability of *Adams* Nature, was pleased to try his obedience by symbolical Precepts: But when the creature should grow to absolute perfection and unchangeablenesse, then such symbolical Precepts, and outward Seals should cease as needlesse.

It is generally granted that the Command concerning the two Trees, was but for the present triall of *Adams* obedience: And hence it follows that as soon as the triall was made, (which was to be made in the very day of *Adams* creation, for God had determined to finish all his Works, both of the visible and invisible Creation, both of the earthly, and of the spiritual Creation, in six dayes, as I have shewed at large in the Institution of the Sabbath) then these symbolical signs of the two Trees must cease as needlesse.

God was pleased to promise the confirmation of his present natural perfections for one act of obedience; so that had *Adam*

but

but once eaten of the Tree of life (undoubtedlesse in wisdome he would have done before any other fruit, if the Devil had not suddenly circumvented him by his Serpentine subtilty) he had been confirmed in his created perfections, and all his posterity with him for ever; and then these symbolical Precepts should have ceased as needlesse, as we see by experience they did cease upon *Adams* once eating of the tree of Knowledge of good and evill; and so in like manner they should have ceased, in case he had but once eaten of the Tree of life; for when a Covenant is once fulfilled, it ceaseth to be a Covenant any more; for the performer hath the perpetual fruition of the benefit of it; and so in like sort, the will of God was, that the once offering of the body of Christ should merit the eternal salvation of all the Elect, *Heb.* 10.10. *Heb.* 7.27. *Heb* 9.28.

Fifthly, This was the first Covenant, saith Mr. *Clendon*, wherein there is no mention of obedience to the moral Law. Secondly, (saith he) *Adam* was under the obedience of the moral Law, before God made any Covenant with him, *Gen.* 1.27. God created man in his own Image; and this Image of God did stand in perfect Knowledge, Righteousnesse, and Holinesse, so that at the first instant of *Adams* creation, he was under the obedience of the Moral Law (even before God brought him into Paradise, for he was created out of Paradise, but the Covenant was not made with him till after he came into Paradise) and being created perfect in knowledge, he did perfectly know the eternal will of God, and accordingly he did perfectly obey it: *And it may well be called the Law of nature, but not a Covenant of nature*, because no promise of any reward was made to *Adam* for keeping the moral Law; therefore perfect obedience to the moral Law, was not the condition of the first Covenant; but it was a necessary condition of mans perfection, and a necessary consequent of Gods perfection that man was so created.

In his Sermon of Justification justified. p. 22.

Sixthly, It is not necessary (saith Mr. *Burges*) to make it a question, whether the breach of the moral Law would have undone *Adam*, and his posterity, as well as the transgression of the positive Law; for all must necessarily think, that the moral Law planted in his heart. *And obedience thereunto*, was the greatest part of *Adams* happinesse and holinesse.

In vindic. legis p. 118.

Mark that, he saith, And obedience thereunto: In which speech he doth fully concur with Mr. *Clendon*, that *Adam* could not sin a moral sin.

In his Book of the heart of Christ in Heaven, p. 50, 51.

Seventhly, Mr. *Thomas Goodwin* saith, The Law given to the first *Adam*, *non comedendi*, was over and above the moral Law, not to eat of the forbidden fruit: And a little after, he calls it, That special Law of not eating the forbidden fruit, which was unto *Adam*, *præceptum symbolicum* (as Divines call it) given over and above, and besides all the ten Commandements, for a trial of his obedience to all the rest; And such (saith he) was this Law given to Christ the second *Adam*.

In vindicia Fœderis p. 60.

Eighthly, saith Mr. *Blake*, The wicked *Jews* at their worst could observe the command of *non licet* meats: And the Command to *Adam* (saith he) was of a like nature.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in *Page* 189.

As God at Mount Sinai, after the Decalogue, gave the Judicial and Ceremonial Laws, which were accessory Commands, part of, and reducible thereunto, as conclusions to their principles; So God at the Creation, having given the Law unto Adam *by writing it in his heart,* Gen. 1. 27. *After that, gave him this accessory Command concerning the Tree of Knowledge of good and evill,* Gen. 2. 17. *part of, and reducible thereto, as a conclusion to its principle.*

And in Page 90. *He concludes that the transgression of* Adam *in eating of the forbidden fruit was a transgression of the same Law of works which was given afterwards by* Moses.

Reply 2. This comparative Argument will not hold, because there is a great difference between the moral Law of nature as it was written in *Adams* heart; and the Decalogue as it was after given by *Moses*.

1 The moral Law written in *Adams* heart is therefore called the moral Law of nature, because it was made con-natural to him in his first creation. But the Decalogue was given by *Moses* to fallen *Adam*, and it was given as a Covenant of grace in Christ.

2 The Decalogue as it was given by *Moses* to fallen *Adam*, was given for the most part by way of prohibition, to restrain mans corrupt nature: But because *Adam* was created after Gods

Image

Image in moral perfections, it was not suitable to be so given to him.

3 There is not the like Reason why indifferent things prohibited by a positive Command should be reduced to the moral Law of nature, as there is why indifferent things prohibited by a positive Command should be reduced to the Decalogue; for the Decalogue was given as a Covenant of grace; and therefore all the types of grace in Christ do appertain to it by vertue Gods positive Command which forbids many things that are indifferent in their own nature.

4 The moral Law of nature did not injoyn *Adam* to observe every seventh day, as a day of rest, as the Decalogue doth.

5 The fourth Command, and some others in the Decalogue are partly of a moral Constitution, and partly of a positive: As for example, to observe some time for Gods special worship is moral, but the determination of every seventh day is positive.

See Trap on Mat. 5 p. 132. & Dr. Ames in Medul. c. 15. Sect. 12. & vindicia legis, p. 62. 148. 213.

6 The moral Law of nature did not require faith in Christ, nor repentance for sin as the Decalogue doth; and therefore all the positive Commands concerning typical purifyings, &c. must needs belong to it.

Seeing then there is so great a difference; This comparative Argument at large will not hold to prove the prohibition given to *Adam* in *Gen.* 2. 17. was a part of, and reducible to the moral Law of nature in *Adam*, as the Ceremonial Law is to the Decalogue.

Reason 2.

If *Adams* eating of the forbidden fruit, had been a sin against the moral Law, then the very natural desire of *Eve* to eat of it, had been a moral sin, before her act of eating; for the Text saith, *It was a desire to her eyes, and she saw it was good for food, and a Tree to be desired, &c.* Gen. 3. 6. And it is a received maxime of all that expound the moral Law, that it binds the inward man, as well as the outward; and so saith our Saviour, *He that looks upon a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery in his heart,* Matth. 5. 28.

If Adams eating had been a sin against the moral Law, then Eves desire to eat had been a sin before her act of eating.

And in that respect, Mr. *Norton* doth affirm it in *Page* 63.

That

That we (in *Adam*) first sinned in soul properly.

Adam sinned not in soul untill he had first sinned in body.

And hence it follows by Mr. *Nortons* Divinity, that there was a first sin in *Eve* before her act of eating; And then her act of eating had not been her first sin, as usually it is esteemed and called; and indeed as the very letter of the Text doth plainly affirm, *In the day thou eatest thereof* (and not in the day thou desirest to eat) *shalt thou dye the death*; Therefore it is a palpable untruth to affirm, that we first sinned in soul properly in *Adam*.

When the Woman saw that the Tree was good for food, and that it was a desire to her eyes; yet if then she had but stayed her desire here, and had gone no further, she had not sinned; For such positive Laws as this, do not bind the inward man, but the outward man only.

1 Take this Instance; If a *Jew* had desired to eat Swines flesh to satisfie his hunger, because it was good food by creation, and yet had forborn the act of eating, he had not sinned against the prohibition of the positive Ceremonial Law; and therefore that Law did not bind any such person to purifie himself by washing, in regard of his said inward desire to eat.

2 Take another Instance: It was a Ceremonial sin, by the Ceremonial law to touch a dead Corps, because it defiled the outward man only, and not because it defiled the conscience; for it was a necessary duty that was laid upon the conscience, at least upon some of his near relations, not only to desire, but really to touch his dead Corps, and to carry it to its burial.

In Christs dying, at Asser. 5. p. 141.

3 Saith Mr. *Rutherford*, The Law of God because it is holy and spiritual, doth require a conformity in all the inclinations and motions of our soul, and the Law of nature; but an absolute conformity between all our inclinations, and every positive command of God, such as was the Lords Command that Christ should dye for sinners, is not required in the Law of God.

If *Adam* (saith he) had submitted his natural hunger and desire to eat of the forbidden fruit, and had not eaten, there had been no sinful jarring between his will and Gods positive Law, *Thou shalt not eat of the Tree of knowledge of good and evil.*

And

And at *Asser.* 4. *page* 140. he saith thus; A conditional and submissive desire, though not agreeable to a positive Law and Command of God, is no sin; nor doth the Law (positive) require a conformity in our inclinations and first motions of desire.

Gods Command to *Abraham* (saith he) to kill his only Son, and to offer him a sacrifice to God, was a meer positive Command; for it is not a command of the Law of Nature (nor any other then positive) for the Father to kill the Son; yet if *Abrahim* do still retain a natural inclination of love (commanded also in the Law of nature) to save his Sons life, and doth desire that he may still live, this desire and inclination, though it be contradictory to a positive Command of God, is no sin, because the fifth Commandement, grounded on the Law of nature, did command it.

Mat. 26. 39. The Command of God for Christ to dye, was not a moral, but a positive Command.

And Christs desire that the Cup might passe from him was no sin, *Mat.* 26. 39. *Luke* 22. 42. because the Command that he should lay down his life was not a moral Command (as Mr. *Norton* holds) but a positive command, and that command (saith he) did never root out his natural desire to preserve his own life, seeing he submitted his desire to Gods will. And saith he in page 217. The Articles of the Covenant between the Father and the Son are diversly propounded; but at thirdly, saith he, the Father bargains by way of work, or hire, or wages, to give a seed to his Son, *Es.* 53. 10. *When he shall make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his Seed, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hands.*

But Mr. *Norton* in opposition to the Dialogue, affirmeth, That Gods Command to Christ to lay down his life, was a moral Command, and that Christs obedience thereto was an obedience to the moral Law, in page 57. &c. And though he doth often cite *Rutherford* for him, yet in this he is point blank against him.

These considerations taken from these Ceremonial Laws, and sundry such like which might be produced from sundry other positive Laws, do prove that *Adam* sinned not in soul, but in body only, at first, by his actual eating of the forbidden fruit, by which sinfull bodily act, his body was originally defiled with a contagious sinful nature, and then his soul was defiled

with that contagion, by reason of its personal union with his body; just in the same manner as the infused souls of children are ever since. We say not (saith *Peter Martyr*) that the soul is corrupted of the body by a natural action; but for as much as the body is corrupt, it resisteth the soul, and the soul not being confirmed with those gifts which it had in the beginning, obeyeth the inclination thereof, and is governed by it; and therefore hence it follows,

See *P. Mar.* in Rom. 5. 18. and in his Com. Pl. *part.* 2 *cap.* 1. *Sect.* 26. and *Zanchy Tract. Theol.* 4. *de peccato originali.*

First, That *Adams* sin was not a sin against the moral Law, for there is no sin against the moral Law properly, till the soul consent.

Secondly, Hence it follows, That the guilt of *Adams* bodily sin was not imputed to his soul, till his soul had first received the contagion of his sin from his body, by vertue of personal union, and by vertue of Gods justice as a punishment on him for the breach of Gods first Covenant.

Thirdly, Hence it follows, That Christs soul could not be made guilty of *Adams* first bodily sin by Gods imputation, except he had been under the same Covenant of nature as all the rest of *Adams* natural posterity are; and so under the same obligation to his punishment of original death by original sin.

Reason 3.

See *Blake* on the Covenant. p. 19. The perfection of *Adams* moral principles was such that he could not will to sin against his natural moral principles. See *Perkins* on the Creed. p. 159, &c.

The frame and constitution of *Adams* nature was such, that he could not will to sin against the moral Law of nature (in case he had been tempted to a moral sin) as I noted a little before from Mr. *Clendon* and Mr. *Burges*: It is too grosse an imagination to think that *Adam* being created after Gods Image in a perfect moral rectitude, could will to sin against his moral natural principles; doubtlesse it was more connatural to *Adam* to forbear sinning against the moral law of nature, then it was to forbear eating of the Tree of knowledge of good and evil.

Mr. *Perkins* moveth this question, How could *Adam*, created after Gods Image, will sin? *For a good tree cannot bring forth evill fruit.*

He answereth thus; Freedome of will to that which is absolutely evil was not in *Adam* in his innocency: But (saith he, at fourthly) Freedome of will to things that are good in their own

own nature, and which may become evill through prohibition: This was in *Adam* before his Fall.

And Mr. *Clendon* saith thus; The moral Law could not be the condition of the first Covenant, because *Adam* could not break the moral Law; he could not sin directly against any branch of the moral Law, because he was created perfect, both in his understanding, will, and affections, as all confesse; his understanding did perfectly apprehend the nature of God, and did perfectly know the will of God in all things contained in the moral Law, and his will and affections did perfectly follow the dictates of his understanding, and therefore he could not sin directly against the moral Law. In his Sermon of Justification justified. p. 13.

And presently after he saith,

The liberty of *Adams* will did consist in this, That he could not will any moral evill; and herein he was created after the Image of God (who is the most free Agent) and therefore doth always necessarily will that, and only that which is good; But about things indifferent in their own nature, he had a liberty to will or nill, to chuse or refuse, &c.

And thus Mr. *Perkins*, and Mr. *Clendon* do concur with this reason; and so doth Mr. *Burges* in *Vindiciæ Legis* page 118. aforecited.

Reason 4.

Adams ignorance of that positive Law which God had given to the Angels, and of the Event thereof, made him the more apt to be surprised by Sathans temptations concerning that positive Law which God had put upon him.

Adams ignorance of that positive Law (and of the event) that was given to the Angels made him the more apt to be deceived by the temptation.

For though *Adam* was perfect in the knowledge of all moral duties, yet he was ignorant of that positive Law that was first given to the Celestial Spirits, which was, that they as well as the visible creatures should attend upon *Adam* and *Eve* into Paradise, as I have shewed in the Institution of the Sabbath; neither was *Adam* acquainted with the disobedience and fall of many of these Celestial Spirits, for their refusing to attend upon *Adam* and *Eve*; neither did *Adam* know that they had obtained leave of God to tempt him about things indifferent in their own nature; in these things *Adam* might well be ignorant, for their actings, being Spirits are not subject to be discerned by bodily

ſenſes. But the Devil in the Serpent knew all theſe things experimentally, and he knew alſo that *Adam* was ignorant of them; and therefore when the Serpent talked with the Woman about the moſt excellent benefit of the forbidden fruit, he was too cunning for her: Doubtleſſe ſhe thought that the Devil in the Serpent was no other but a good creature of God, for ſhe knew that God had commanded all the viſible creatures to attend upon her and *Adam*, as their Lord, and to ſerve them for their beſt good, and ſhe could not imagine that any creature could be ſo wicked as to perſwade her to do any thing that might tend to her hurt.

In theſe and ſuch like things her underſtanding was not inlightned (as it was in the knowledge of all moral duties) and therefore in theſe things ſhe being as yet ignorant, might eaſily be ſwayed in her will and affections about things indifferent in their own nature, and therefore ſhe ſeeing that the Tree was good for meat, and a deſire to her eyes, and that it was to be deſired to make one more wiſe in the Theory of good and evill, more then ſhe had by Creation, ſhe was perſwaded to take and eat, and then with her hand ſhe reached out ſome of it to her husband, and he ſuſpecting no hurt from her that was given to be a meet helper to him, did take and eat, and then the eyes of them both were opened, not only in the Theory, but alſo in the experience of evil upon themſelves; for now they ſaw and felt their preſent ſpiritual death in ſin.

This I bring to ſhew that *Adam* did not ſin againſt the moral Law of nature, but againſt a poſitive Law only, about things in their own nature indifferent; and therefore that the moral Law was no part of the firſt Covenant with *Adam*.

If *Adam* had been tempted to a moral ſin, his moral perfections were ſuch, that he would ſoon have found out the Fall of Angels; for *Adams* ſoul was as perfect in the knowledge of all moral things as Chriſts ſoul was; and therefore though Chriſt permitted the Devil to tempt him for forty dayes together, yet when at laſt the Devil ſaw he could not prevail with thoſe temptations, he began to tempt him to moral ſins, namely to worſhip him, &c. But then Jeſus ſaid unto him, *Hence Satan*, Mat. 4. 10. The like would *Adam* have ſaid, if he had been tempted to a moral ſin.

As the first (saith *Peter Martyr*) *Adam* could not by his reason know, that the Devil was fallen, or else his will had been governed by his mind. In Appendix to his Com. pl. p. 145.

Conclusions from the Premisses.

1 Hence we may discern what was the true nature of the first Covenant, namely, that it did not consist in *Adams* obedience or disobedience to the moral Law of nature; But in his obedience or disobedience to a meer positive Law, concerning his act of eating of the two Trees.

2 Hence it follows, That in case the Devil had first tempted *Adam* to a moral sin, he had by that act discovered himself to *Adam* (as he did to Christ) to be naught, & then the Devil had lost his labour in his temptation, for then *Adams* will would have been governed by his inlightned mind, and then such temptations would have been loathsome to his pure nature, as they were to Christ, and then he would have said to Sathan as Christ did, *Hence Sathan*, and then Sathan could not have prevailed afterwards; for *Adams* wisdome was such that he would not have delayed to eat of the Tree of life in the first place, as the best food for his confirmation.

3 Hence it follows, That *Adam* did not first sin in soul, as Mr. *Norton* holds, and as indeed he had done, in case he had sinned against any branch of the moral Law of nature; but his sin was only against that positive Law, that did only forbid his bodily act of eating, as the only breach of the first Covenant of Works.

4 Hence it follows, That the arguing of the Dialogue in p. 188. is sound and good; namely, in affirming that the punishment of original sin did not fall upon us for the breach of the moral Law, but for the breach of such a positive Law, as is of a far differing nature from the moral Law. Original sin did not fall upon us for the breach of the moral Law, but for the breach of a positive Law and Covenant, about things indifferent in their own nature.

5 Hence it follows, That if *Adam* had but once eaten of the Tree of life (as his wisdome would have caused him to do in the very first place, if the Devil had not so speedily circumvented him, he had thereby been confirmed in his created perfections and all his posterity with him; they should have had a propagated Righteousnesse, because God did enter into Covenant with

with *Adam* as a publick person, saith Mr. *Burges*, and also generally all Protestant Divines.

The moral Law of nature was not ordained for *Adams* justification; but as a condition only of his created perfection, therefore it would have been the rule of his life, if he had but first eaten of the tree of life.

6 Hence it follows, That the moral Law in *Adams* nature, was not ordained for *Adams* justification (as Mr. *Norton* holds) but only as a necessary condition of his created perfection; for God could not make man perfect, but by making him perfectly conformable to the moral Law.

But Mr. *Norton* saith in Page 231.

That four things were requisite to Adams *justification by the works of the Law.* And at fourthly he saith, *That justification was promised to eternal continuance in obedience.*

Reply. From this Assertion it follows, That *Adam* might have continued Ten thousand years in his integrity, and yet have failed at last, and so he should never have been justified by the works of the Law, and then some of his children should have been begotten after the Image of God in those Ten thousand years space, and all the rest after that time after the Image of Satan.

And Mr. *Norton* in Page 254. hath another Paradox as strange as this, namely, *That upon supposition of* Adams *continuance in obedience, all the acts of his obedience, even to the finishing of perfect Righteousnesse, had been imputed unto his seed according unto the nature of the Covenant of works, unto their attaining of justification by the Law.*

And saith he in Page 244, *Adams justification consisted not in one act of obedience.*

No act of *Adams* obedience had been imputed to his posterity, for their obedience, but his first act in eating of the tree of life, in case he had stood.

This Assertion is directly contrary to the Tenure of the first Covenant; For it is acknowledged by *Bucanus* (whom I have cited with *Paræus* in Sect. 3.) that all the sins of *Adam* were truly personal except the first, and that first sin (in eating the forbidden fruit) was not so much personal, as natural, namely it was common to the nature of man in general by vertue of Gods Covenant: And just the same must be affirmed of the acts of *Adams* obedience: That upon supposition of his obedience in eating of the Tree of life the first act only of his obedience, should have been accounted as a common act of obe-

obedience to the nature of man in general by vertue of Gods Covenant. See *Vindicæ Legis* also in p. 119, 120.

Secondly, Hence also it follows, That in case *Adam* had first eaten of the Tree of life, that act also had justified him no further, but from Sathans accusation; And therefore it is a great mistake in Mr. *Norton* to affirm, as he doth in Page 189. that the moral Law is called the Law of works in *Rom.* 3.27. because it required personal obedience to life. But any man that hath but half an eye, may see that the word *Law* in *Rom.* 3.27. hath relation to the whole Oeconomy of *Moses*, but especially to the Ceremonial Law: And indeed the Ceremonial Law did teach an outward justification from their Ceremonial sins in respect of their personal coming to the Sanctuary. Rom. 3.27.

I grant that *Adam* in his innocency stood in need of a confirmation of his created perfections; but he stood not in any need of justification before his fall, except only of justification from the Devils accusation and temptation (as I said before) for no doubt the Devil had said to God (as he said afterwards against *Job*) that if he might have but leave to tempt *Adam*, then *Adam* would disobey as they had done; But in case *Adam* had not yeelded to Sathans temptation, but had taken warning by the prohibition, and by the threatning, and had not eaten of the forbidden fruit, but had first eaten of the Tree of life, then he had been justified by that act against Sathans accusation and temptation; but he needed no justification in respect of his obedience to the moral Law of nature; whiles he stood in his created perfections, and therefore *Rom.* 3.27. doth not prove that the moral Law was ordained to be the Covenant of works for *Adams* justification, much lesse was it ordained to that end for fallen man; For saith Mr. *Burges*, God did not since the fall of man ever transact with him in any other Covenant but that of Grace. In *Vindication of Just.* pag. 213. 192.

The safest way, is, to hold That God did never ordain the moral Law, neither in *Adams* Innocency, nor since his Fall, to be a rule of justification by works. See *Wotton de Reconc. peccatoris part.* 2. *lib.* 1. *c.* 6, 7. And *Blake* approves him. See also *Ball* on the Covenant, p. 102, 130, 135, 168, 178.

Seventhly, Hence it follows, That sinners cannot be justified formally by Gods imputation of Christs obedience to the first Covenant of works, unlesse it can be proved that Christ did

did purposely make a voyage into the earthly Paradise of *Eden*, there to eat actually of the Tree of life, as our Surety in our room and stead, to the end that God might impute his fulfilling of the first Covenant to us, for our formal justification.

Such absurd consequences as these will often necessarily follow from Mr. *Nortons* Doctrine of Gods imputing Christs obedience to the first Covenant of works for our justification.

Rom. 5 19

Eighthly, Hence we may learn how to understand Rom. 5. 19. namely, as by one mans disobedience to a meer positive Law, the Many as well as the reprobate were made sinners; So by the obedience of one to a meer positive Law in his death and sacrifice, shall the Many be made righteous.

Ninthly, Hence it follows, That it is altogether untrue which Mr. *Norton* affirms in his first Proposition, that Christ did covenant with his Father, both to fulfill the Law of works, and to suffer the essential punishment of the Curse, that thereby he might exactly fulfill the first Covenant in a way of satisfaction to Gods justice for mans justification.

Tenthly, Suppose the first Covenant was made in relation to the moral Law, (which is not granted, nor cannot be proved) yet in that sense there is an answer ready in the words of *Pareus*, That God did never require such a double fulfilling (as Mr. *Norton* layes down in his first Proposition) namely that Jesus Christ did enter into a covenant with his Father both to do the Command in a way of works, and to suffer the essential punishment of the Curse, that so he might thereby exactly fulfill the first Covenant in a way of satisfaction for our Righteousness.

In his Epist. to *Wbitgenseln* at the end of *Ursinus* Catechisme p. 797.

It was never heard (saith *Pareus*) that the Law did oblige both to obedience and punishment at the same time; but every Law obligeth (disjunctively, and not copulatively) either to obedience, or to punishment; for so long as obedience is performed, the Law obligeth not to punishment; that is, it pronounceth no man guilty of punishment; But when obedience is violated, then the Law obligeth the sinner to punishment.

This is generally true (saith he) both of divine and humane Laws. There-

Therefore their Suppositions (saith he) which they do here assume, are untrue, and repugnant to Gods justice, namely, that man after his Fall (and so the Mediator for man) was obliged both to fulfill the Law, and to suffer punishment.

When obedience indeed is violated, the sinner is bound to make satisfaction by suffering punishment: This being performed, he is no more a sinner, and he is tyed to obedience, not to that for the violation of which he hath suffered punishment, but to another new obedience, or if again he violate this, to a new punishment.

I have cited this of *Parens* for the sake of such as hold the true nature of the first Covenant to consist in *Adams* obedience, or disobedience, to the moral Law; and so hold as Mr. *Norton* doth, That no satisfaction can be made to Gods justice, except Christ be our surety to fulfill the first Covenant, by doing the Command in a way of works, and by suffering the Essential punishment of the Curse in a way of Satisfaction.

But I have described the true nature of the first Covenant to lye in *Adams* obedience, or disobedience, to the positive Command only; and shewed from the Orthodox, that Christs obedience in his Incarnation and Death, was not to the moral law, but to a positive Law for satisfaction to Gods justice for our Redemption and Justification.

SECTION 2.

The Examination of Lev. 18. 5.

I Will now examine how Mr. *Norton* doth prove, *That the first Covenant was made in relation to* Adams *obedience, or disobedience, to the moral Law of Nature, and that is by* Lev. 18. 5. *and* Gen. 2. 17.

Reply. First, I will examine *Lev.* 18. 5. (*This do, and thou shalt live*) whether it have his sense or no; for he makes high ac-

count of this Scripture for his purpose, because he doth often cite it, as in *page* 14,140.149,189,191,225.&c.

But I must needs say, I cannot but wonder at his unadvised citing of this Text, to prove the first Covenant of works to belong to the moral Law of nature; seeing it is so clear a proof of the Covenant of Grace.

Lev.18.5. See *Ball* on the Covenant p.136.

These words (saith Mr. *Ball*) *Do this and live*, must not be interpreted as if they did promise life upon a condition of perfect obedience, and for works done in such exactnesse, as is required; But they must be expounded Evangelically, describing the subject capable of life eternal, not the cause why life and salvation is conferred; And by *doing* is to be understood sincere, uniform, and unpartial obedience, not exact fulfilling the Law in every tittle.

Do this and live (saith he) what is it more then this? *If ye will obey my voyce, and do my Commandements, ye shall be to me a peculiar treasure*, Exod.19.5. and to this purpose he citeth *Psal.*119.1,2. *Psal.*106.3. *Psal.*112.1. *James* 1.25. *Rom.*2.7. *Luke* 1.6. All these places (saith he) are to be understood of sincere and upright walking, to shew who are justified, and to whom the promises of life do appertain; but not why they are justified.

Rom.2.13. In like manner (saith he) that speech of the Apostle, *The Doers of the Law are justified*, Rom.2.13. may be expounded Evangelically; not of them that fulfill the Law to be justified by their works, but of them that soundly obey, who are justified of grace by faith: And hence it appears what works the Apostle opposeth to faith in the matter of justification, not only perfect works done by the strength of nature (of which sort there be none at all) but works commanded in the Law as it was given to *Israel*, such as *Abraham* and *David* walked in after they were effectually called: These works cannot be causes together with faith in justification.

2 It is evident, that the Law was given to fallen man as a Covenant of grace: And this Mr. *Ball* shews abundantly in page 102.130,135,166,178.&c.

In *Vindiciæ legis* p.233. Rom.10.5,6. 3 Mr. *Burges* saith thus, *Paul* describeth the righteousnesse of the Law in *Rom.*10.5,6. from these words, *Do this and live*, which are said to have reference to *Lev.*18.5. But saith he, We

We find this in effect in *Deut.*30.16. yet from this very Chapter the Apostle describeth the Righteousnesse which is by faith: and (saith he) *Beza* doth acknowledge, that that which *Moses* speaks of the Law, *Paul* doth apply it to the Gospel.

4 Mr. *Burges* doth also abundantly shew that the Law was given as a Covenant of grace, In page 229. &c. and page 271. and there he doth most justly blame *Beza* and *Perkins*, because they affirmed that we attain salvation by fulfilling the Law, *Do this and live.*

5 Mr. *Baxter* saith, *Do this and live*, is a Gospel condition. In his Saints Rest, p 9.

6 Dr. *Barnes* in his Answer to our Popish Bishops that held justification by works, doth give the cleer sense of *Lev.*18.5. and of *Rom.*2.13. and of *Rom.*3.28. according to the sense of the former; his words I omit, because they are long. Dr. *Barnes* is joyned with *Tindal's* works, p.218.240. Rule 293, 294.

7 Mr. *Wilson* in his Theological Rules for the right understanding of the Scripture, cites this Rule from *Luther*; Precepta (saith *Luther*) presuppose faith, as where it is written, Keep the Commandements, that is by Christ, or by faith in Christ; also, *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, &c.* that is in Christ, or by faith in Christ; also, *Do this, and thou shalt live*, that is, do it in Christ: and so of the rest of this kind.

8 Mr. *Trap* doth thus expound *Lev.*18.5. As the creature lives by his food, so the spiritual life is maintained by an Evangelical keeping of Gods Commandements.

9 The true sense of *Lev.*18.5. compared with the Context, is this,

Do this and live, is a general command, and requires obedience to all the three sorts of Laws in *Moses*, namely, to the Ceremonial and Judicial Laws, as well as to the Moral Law, as the Context doth clearly evidence by naming all the three sorts of Laws in these three termes, Judgements, Ordinances, and Statutes, wherein they were commanded to walk, namely, in sanctified obedience, and then the promise is added, *Which if a man do, he shall live in them*, Lev.18.4,5,26,30.

The like Command and Promise is given for their obedience to the judicial Laws, *Deut.*17.10,11,19. *Deut.*21.9 and to all their Laws in general, *Deut.*5.1,30,31,32. *Deut.*6.1. *Deut.*7.11,12. *Deut.*12.1,28. *Deut.*30.16. *Luke* 10.28.

And this Command in this form of words is often used to urge them to the observation of the Ceremonial Laws, as *Deu.* 12.14 32.

Do the Feast of Weeks, Exod.34.22. so it is in the Hebrew.

Do the Sabbath day, Deut.5.15. Exod.31.16. compared with vers.13,14.

Do the Passover, Deut.16.1. Mat.26.18.

Do the Feast of Booths, Deut.16.13.

Do Sacrifice, Exod.10.25. 1 King.12.27. Jer.33.18.

Do thy Sin, That is, Do thy Sin-offerings, *Lev.*9.7,22. *Lev.* 16.9. *Exod.*29.36,39,41,42.

But because the carnal Jews looked no further in the doing of all this, but to an outward conformity, their services were rejected; whence it is evident, that the Lord commanded the doing of all these things in the obedience of faith, and so the Lord did expound his mind and meaning to *Cain*, *If thou do well, shalt thou not be accepted?* intimating that well-doing did not consist in an outward form only, nor only in the excellent quality of his offerings which he presented, but in the qualification of his heart, in the manner of his offering, *Heb.*11.4. and because he wanted faith with his offering, the Apostle concludes, that his works were evill, because his good sacrifices were done in an evill manner for lack of faith.

So that Gods Command, *Do this and live*, implies, do it in faith and live, as Christ saith in *Matth.*7.21. *He that doth the will of my Father*, namely that doth it in faith, and then the Promise is annexed, *This is the will of my Father, that he which believeth in the Son, should have life everlasting*, Joh.6.40. and said the Jews to him in vers. 28. *What shall we do that we may work the works of God? Jesus answered, This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent*, vers.29. The like Question and Answer is in *Act.* 16.30,31. and therefore believing is commanded in the Law as the chief work, 1 *Joh.*3.23. *Act.*17.30. 1 *Thes.*1.3. unto which we must give obedience, *Rom.*1.5. and there are no good works that can proceed from any that will be accepted of God for good works, but from those that are *created in Christ Jesus unto good works*, Eph.2.10.

Thus far I have made it evident that *Lev.*18.5. is to be understood of such a doing of the Law as belongs to the Covenant of

of grace, and therefore it is no proof that the moral Law of nature was the condition of the first Covenant.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in his fifth Propositon in page 3. *Adams obedience to the moral Law was by Gods free Covenant ordained to merit life by.*

2 *Reply.* If Mr. *Norton* had proved as well, as affirmed, that God had ordained the moral Law by his free Covenant to merit life by, then he had hit the nail upon the head; but his proofs hitherto have failed, and I beleeve it is past his skill to give any cleer proof of it.

Adams obedience to the moral Law of nature, was con-natural to him, and therfore it was not ordained to merit life by.

True it is (saith Mr. *Ball* page 133.) that the promises run upon this condition, *If ye obey my Voyce, and do my Commandements.*

But (saith he) Conditions are of two sorts,

Antecedent, or

Consequent.

Antecedent, when the condition is the cause of the thing promised or given, as in all civill Contracts of justice, where one thing is given for another. (The like may be said of the first Covenant made with *Adam*; God by way of free Covenant did condition to confirm him in his created perfections, for one act of obedience, namely, in case he had but first eaten of the Tree of life: As I have shewed more at large in Sect. 1.)

2 There is a Consequent condition, when the condition is annexed to the promise as a qualification in the subject, or an adjunct that must attend the thing promised; And in this latter sense obedience to the Commandements was a condition to the promise, not the cause why the thing promised was vouchsafed, but a qualification in the subject capable, or a consequent of such great mercy conferred.

Secondly, I do further reply thus; That the doing in *Lev.* 18.5. is not the same for substance with the first Covenant of works (as Mr. *Norton* affirms.)

1 Because it speaks only of the manner of obedience in the Covenant of grace.

2 It is not the same with the moral Law of nature in respect of duties; for the moral Law of nature is not a compleat rule for duties to us, without some supply from the Gospel; for the Law of nature doth not command us to worship God in Christ, as the Decalogue doth; the moral Law of nature doth not command us to beleeve, to repent, and to yeeld subjection to Christ, as the Decalogue doth (as Mr. *Burges* hath largely observed in *Vindiciæ legis*) neither doth the Law of nature forbid sins against the Gospel, as unbeleef, impenitency, and contempt of grace, as the Decalogue doth; neither doth the Law of nature command us to sanctifie every seventh day, as the Decalogue doth: All these things are added by the Covenant of grace to the Decalogue, more then was in the moral Law of nature.

Therefore the *Doing* in *Lev.*18.5. is not the same for substance with the first Covenant, neither in respect of justification, nor in respect of sanctified walking.

Conclusion touching Lev.18.5.

From all these Premises it follows, that *Lev.*18.5. is not meant of doing by way of merit; as doing the Command in eating of the Tree of life would have been a meritorious act according to Gods free grace in the first Covenant, and therefore the moral Law of nature, and the Decalogue (which comprehends the Covenant of grace) is not the same for substance.

2 Hence it follows, that the doing of the moral Law by *Adam*, and the doing of it by Christ, was con-natural to them, and therefore it was not ordained as the inviolable rule of Gods Relative Justice for mans justification and life, as Mr. *Norton* doth propound it.

SECT

SECT. 3.

The Examination of Gen.2.17.

THis Scripture is alleged by Mr. *Norton*, to prove that the most principal death there threatned (for the breach of the first Covenant of works) was eternal death in hell, and saith he, in his first Proposition, *Christ (as the Surety of the Elect) suffered the Essential punishment of this curse in a way of obedient satisfaction unto divine Justice, thereby exactly fulfilling the first Covenant.* In his second Proposition, he saith, *That God in the first Covenant proceeded with man in a way of Justice.* In his third Proposition he calls it *Relative Justice.* In his sixth Proposition, he calls it, *The Rule of Gods proceeding between God and man.* In his eighth Proposition, he saith, *That God having constituted that inviolable rule of Relative Justice* in Gen.2.17. *could not avoid, in respect of his power now limited, to proceed by this Rule*, namely, first, *according to the recompense contained in the promise in case of obedience*; or secondly, *according to the punishment contained in the curse in case of disobedience.*

We have already seen how much Mr. *Norton* is mistaken in the first part of the Covenant; First, by opening the true nature of the Covenant in Sect. 1. And secondly, by overturning his first proof in *Lev.18 5.*

Now it remains to expound.

Now the true nature of that death that is threatned in Gen.2.17. shall be explained. And then we shall see whether it be the inviolable Rule of Gods Justice, for Christ suffering in a way of satisfaction for mans Redemption.

1 *Reply*, Gen.2.17. *In the day thou eatest thereof, Thou shalt dye the death.*

The true nature of this death, I make to be a spiritual death in sin only.

This is evident by two Circumstances in the Text.

1 By

The death in Gen.2. 17 is limited by two Circumstances to our spiritual death in sin only, and therefore that death is the essential curse there threatned; and therefore 2. Christ was not a Surety with *Adam* in the first Covenant, to bear that death that is there threatned.

1 By the adjunct of time; *In the day*, or at what time soever.

2 By the Antithesis of his death threatned, to the kind of life that was promised.

First, No other death according to this adjunct of time was threatned to be formally executed, but a spiritual death in sin only. And therefore first, no other death was properly threatned in this Text. And therefore secondly, it was a foul mistake in *Ambrose* to hold that bodily death only was threatned in this Text, because said he, There was no day nor hour wherein our first Parents were not *mortis obnoxii*, subject to death.

But Dr. *Willet* in *Rom.*5. Q.21. doth thus answer him, The words of the Text, *in Dying, thou shalt dye*, seem to imply an actuall death, which they should then suffer, and not a potential only.

Secondly, I answer further, that if a bodily death were there only meant, or chiefly meant, as others say, then where shall we find any other Text besides this, wherein our spiritual death in sin is threatned? surely there is no other Scripture that threatens our spiritual death in sin, but this Text only, neither was spiritual death executed at any other time, but at this time only; It was but once threatned, nor but once executed, and that was done in the day or time of *Adams* eating; therefore that death only is the death that is threatned in *Gen.*2.17.

2 The true nature of this death may the better be discerned by considering the true nature of *Adams* sin; whether it was a sin against the moral Law, or against a positive Law only,

1 I have already shewed, That it was not a sin against the moral Law of nature; and therefore *Adam* was not under the obligation to punishment by that Law.

2 Neither was his sin the sin of a single person, for then *Adam* himself only had been under the obligation to the punishment threatned.

3 Therefore it was a sin against a supreme positive Law only made concerning outward things that were indifferent in their own nature; and I never heard that eternal death was ever directly threatned for the breach of any outward positive

positive Law, but at first a spiritual death in sin, and ever after a bodily death only; but yet for want of faith in Christ, eternal death will follow after a bodily death.

4. It was a sin against the good of mans nature in general, because it was a sin against that Covenant which God had made with *Adam* concerning the condition of mans nature, as he was the head of mans nature in general, as I have shewed in Sect. 1.

If his sin had been a moral sin only, then he had been obliged to the punishment of the moral Law; but I never heard that the moral Law did oblige sinners to the punishment of death in sin, to make their nature in themselves, and in their posterity, more sinful then it was by *Adams* sin; for by *Adams* sin, all are alike sinners (in the same degree) of originall sin.

Therefore Gods Covenant with *Adam* was by ordaining a special positive Law, unto which he annexed a special positive punishment for the transgression of that Law, which was a spiritual death in sin affixed to the very time of sinning; and for the breach of other positive Ceremonial Laws after this, a bodily death only is often expresly threatned.

Bucanus propounds this Question; If *Adam* had stood in his original Righteousnesse, should it have been derived to all his posterity? *Bucanus* in his 10. Com. place.

It should (saith he) First, because it was the righteousnesse of mans nature, and not the righteousnesse of a private person. Secondly, (saith he) because the contrary to it, namely original sin, was derived by *Adams* means to all his posterity (Christ only excepted.) Thirdly, (saith he) because every like begets his like in nature and kind.

And saith *Bucanus* in his fifteenth Common place, The first sin was not so much personal and proper to *Adam* as natural, that is, saith he, common to all mans nature which originally and naturally was in his loyns: but saith he, The other sins of *Adam* were truly personal, of which *Ezek.* 18.20. *The son shall not bear the iniquity of his father, but the soul that sinneth shall dye.* The first Covenant was made in relation to mans nature in generall, and not with *Adam* as a single person.

And *Peterus* cited by *Dr. Willet* saith thus, As the sins of Parents are not now transmitted to their children; so neither *Willet* in Rom. 5. Q. 19.

were all *Adams* sins propagated to posterity, but only the first between which, and his other sins, there was this difference. That by the first, the goodnesse of mans nature was lost. And by the other, the goodnesse of *Adams* grace was taken away.

3 Hence it follows, that seeing *Adams* sin was not so much against his person, as it was against mans nature in general (for it was against the Covenant that God made with him, touching mans nature in general, he being the head of mans nature) therefore the death threatned was such a kind of death as was to be formally executed on mans nature in general at the very instant of *Adams* sinning, and that was no other but a spiritual death in sin only; and this death takes hold of all flesh as soon as ever they have life in the womb, none excepted of them that are born by the ordinary way of generation; so then the punishment of death which God first threatned and inflicted on *Adams* nature for his sinfull act against the first Covenant, by eating of the forbidden fruit, was a spiritual death in sin, which is now become nature to us, because the Covenant being broken, the punishment must fall on our nature, as soon as we have any being in nature; but bodily death was not then formally executed, neither is formally executed on our nature in the womb, as death in sin is, but after some distance of time; neither shall it be executed formally on all flesh as death in sin is, for many shall escape a bodily death at the day of Judgement; and therefore no other death was threatned, and formally executed on mans nature in general, at the instant of *Adams* eating, but a spiritual death in sin only. Yea Mr. *Norton* himself in page 116. doth exempt many from bodily death at the day of Judgement; Such as are alive (saith he) at the day of Judgement shall not formally dye by the separation of their soul from their body; So then it follows by good consequence, that neither a bodily death, nor eternal death in hell, was threatned to be formally executed on mans nature in general, at the instant of *Adams* sinning, but a spiritual death in sin onely. And Dr. *Willet* saith, That the death threatned seems to be an actual death which they should then suffer, and not a potential only; not that *Adams* soul (saith Mr. *Perkins*) was now utterly abolished, but because it was as though it were not, and

and because it ceased to be in respect of righteousnesse and fellowship with God; and indeed (saith he) This is the Death of all deaths, when the creature hath subsisting and being, and yet is deprived of all comfortable fellowship with God. In the right way of dying well, p. 492.

The second Circumstance that proves this death threatned to be meant only of death in sin, is the Antithesis of the kind of life promised, to the death here threatned.

Now the life promised to *Adam* by Gods Covenant, was the confirmation, and the continuance of his created natural perfections, to him, and to all his posterity for ever, in case he did first eat of the Tree of life; once eating should have merited the blessing, as once eating did merit the curse; and this was signified by the name that was given to that Tree, It was a name that did define the Covenant-quality of that Tree, and in that respect God commended it to *Adam* as a symbolical sign of his Covenant: And saith *Christopher Carlisle*, where you have this Hebrew word *Cajim* in the duall number, it signifieth immortality, as *genuses Cajim*, the Tree of Lives; of which saith he, if *Adam* had tasted, it would have brought immortality; and very many other Writers do agree that the life promised was the continuance, and the confirmation of his natural perfections in this world; this I beleeve is the truth: and thence it follows by way of opposition thereto, that the death threatned must be understood of the continuance of a spiritual death in this world only, and not of any other death, till another death was threatned after this; for the first spiritual death might have continued to *Adam* and to his posterity for ever in this world, and that in the highest degree of all misery, according to the justice of Gods threatning, without any bodily death, for any thing that was at this present revealed to the contrary; and we know that hereafter a bodily life shall be continued for ever to the damned, after the Resurrection, without any bodily death, notwithstanding their spiritual death: for as bodily death is now ordained to be the immediate effect of death in sin; so at the general Resurrection eternall death in hell, is ordained to be the immediate effect of death in sin without any bodily death.

The life promised to *Adam* and so to mans nature in generall, was a perpetuall life in this world, in his created perfections.

See *Ball* on the Covenant, p. 6. 10. and *Vindiciæ legis* p. 139. And *Grotius*, & *Camero*, & *Bucer.* in *Eccl.* & the Hebrew Drs. cited by *Ainsw.* in Gen. 2. 17. And saith *Austin*, *Adam* had the Tree of life in Paradise, that age should not consume and end his life. Cited by *Marbeck* in his Com pl p. 791

And we know also that notwithstanding God did at the

instant of *Adams* sinful eating, execute on him this spiritual death of sin; yet it pleased God also in a short time after, to Relax the rigor and outrage of this spiritual death to, all mankind in general in this life.

All the glory of Gods creation had been confounded at the time of *Adams* fall, if Christ had not been foreordained to be ready at hand to take on him the Government of all.

And secondly, to alter it much more to the Elect; for God had ordained that his Son Jesus Christ should be the Heir of all things, as soon as ever *Adam* fell, and that he should at the instant of *Adams* fall, take on him the Rule and Government of the whole Creation, now in rebellion and confusion by *Adams* fall, and that he should uphold all things by the word of his power, *Heb.*1.3. and in a special manner should rule over mans corruption, and Sathans malice; or else if Christ had not been provided in Gods eternal Counsel and Providence, in a readinesse to undertake the Government of all this in this point of time, no man can imagine what a hell would have been here on earth through mans spiritual death in sin, and Sathans malice, if Christ Jesus had not been prepared to interpose in the Government.

And secondly, It pleased God presently after the execution of his spiritual death in sin, to declare his eternal Counsel and Providence for the redeeming of *Adam*, and all his elect posterity from this desperate Head-plot of Sathan, and from this miserable death of sin, thereby altering the execution of that heavy sentence in a great measure; or else if God in his eternal Counsel and Providence had not found out a way to alter this sentence, there had been no room left for the manifestation of the Covenant of grace by the promised Seed; for till the time of Gods gracious manifestation, *Adam* and all his posterity was extrinsecally under the execution of Gods vindicative threatning; but it pleased the Lord of his rich mercy presently after to deliver him there-from; for God said thus by way of threatning to the devil; The Seed of that Woman (whom thou hast deceived) shall break thy Head-plot by his death and sacrifice, and thou shalt have a liberty of power to do thy worst to hinder it; And therefore when he shall make his soul a sacrifice for sin, thou shalt at the same time have a liberty of power to peirce him in the foot-soals as a wicked Malefactor, *Gen.*3.15. but yet so perfect shall be his patience, that no ignominy nor torture shall disturb his patience

thence, nor pervert him in his obedience from accomplishing his death as a sacrifice, and by this means shall thy cunning Head-plot be broken in peeces, and the Elect shall be delivered as the Bird is from the Snare of the Fowler when it is broken.

Now to bring this work of Redemption to passe, a double change must be wrought in fallen man, by the Mediation of this Promised Seed.

1 A change of our corrupt qualities by a Regeneration.

2 A change of our present state, from being the children of wrath by nature, to be the children of God by his grace of Adoption.

1 The alteration or change of our corrupt qualities is done by a twofold Regeneration.

1 When the qualities of our souls and bodies are changed from bad to good (which is done but in part whiles we live in this world) through the Word and Spirit; *For except a man be born again of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdome of God*, Joh. 3.5. But this Regeneration, as I said, is done but in part, for as long as we live in this world, this body of sin doth still in part remain, and therefore we can have but the first fruits of the Spirit here.

2 The full degree of our Regeneration, is not till the day of the general Resurrection, and then all those that have been in part regenerated here, shall be fully regenerated after they have suffered a bodily death here, to fit them for that full Regeneration; for without such a change of our corrupt nature by death, flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God, neither can corruption inherit incorruption, 1 *Cor.* 15.50. And in this respect (saith *Christopher Carlisle*) the Resurrection is called by Christ, *A Regeneration, a new Birth, a Revocation, a Rising from the dead, a Restitution from above*, Matth. 19.28. Rom. 8.23. And therefore such as are regenerate, and in part sanctified here, must suffer a bodily death, that so at the Resurrection of all flesh they may be perfectly regenerate in body, as well as in soul, and then this corruptible shall put on incorruption, and this mortal shall put on immortality, 1 *Cor.* 15.53. *Ph.* 3.21.

In his Treatise of Christs descent into hell p. 31.

Now therefore behold the Justice and Mercy of God in ordaining a bodily death; for as soon as God had dispatched this gracious Declaration in *Gen.* 3. 15. he did presently after, namely, in vers. 19. which is but four verses after the promise, tell beleeving *Adam* (as he was the head of mans corrupt nature in general) *Dust thou art, and to dust thou shalt return*; And thus from the order of time when this threatning was denounced, It follows,

1 That a bodily death was not denounced, untill after Christ was declared to be the Seed of the Woman to break the Devils Head-plot (by purchasing a new Nature, and a new Paradise for *Adam*, and as many else of his posterity as did beleeve in the Promised Seed) but this threatning of a bodily death did imply a further degree of misery to all the rest of his posterity that did live and dye in the unbelief of the Promised Seed; for when God did first appoint a bodily death, he did then also appoint a day of Judgement, as *Heb.* 9. 27. doth expound the threatning in *Gen.* 3. 19.

2 This is also worthy of all due consideration; That this bodily death was not threatned to be formally executed in the day of *Adams* sinful eating, as death in sin was.

3 Neither was a bodily death threatned to be formally executed on any certain day afterwards.

4 Neither did God cease to threaten a bodily death, as he ceased to threaten a spiritual death, after this time; but upon the committing of such and such sins, he did still from time to time threaten a bodily death: But after the first threatning of a spiritual death in sin, God did never threaten that death any more; he did but once threaten that death, and but once execute it.

5 When God denounced the sentence of a bodily death to beleeving *Adam* he adjudged him and all his beleeving posterity no further then their bodies to the earth, whence Christ should one day raise them, and by that means utterly abolish from them all sin and corruption; but he adjudged his unbeleeving seed, not only to a bodily, but also to an eternal death in hell.

6 From this appointment of a bodily death in *Gen.* 3. 19. and not from that death in *Gen.* 2. 17. must all the Scriptures

have reference that speak of a bodily death.

¶ Hence it is evident, that bodily death was not at first threatned in *Gen.* 2. 17. as the immediate effect of *Adams* first sin, but as an immediate effect and punishment of original sin: and this is further evident by *Rom.* 5. 12. *As by one man* (namely by one mans disobedience, as it is explained in verse 19.) *sin entred into the world* (namely original sin) *and death by sin* (namely a bodily death by original sin.) Rom. 5. 12. 19.

And the matter is yet more plain by vers. 14. *Nevertheless death reigned from* Adam *to* Moses, *over them that had not sinned after the similitude of* Adams *transgression*; that is to say, Death reigned over Infants from *Adam* to *Moses* for their original sin, before ever they had sinned actually after the similitude of *Adams* Transgression; and saith *Paul* in verse 21. *Sin* (namely original sin) *reigned unto death*: Hence it follows, that the wages of *Adams* first sin was death in sin; and the wages of his original sin was a bodily death only to beleevers, and eternal death to all unbeleevers, *Rom.* 6. 23.

And it is evident, that this is an ancient orthodox Tenet, that bodily death did first enter into the world by original sin.

Fulgentius de incarn. & gratia Christi, ch. 12. saith, Except the death of the soul had gone before by sin, the death of the body had never followed after as a punishment; and saith he in Chap. 13. Our flesh is born with the punishment of death and the pollution of sin; and of young children he saith, By what justice is an infant subjected to the wages of sin; if there be no uncleanesse of sin in him?

And saith *Prosper*, *de promiss. & praedict. part.* 3. c. 5. The punishment of sin which *Adam* the root of mankind received by Gods sentence (saying, *Earth thou art, and to earth thou shalt return*, Gen. 3. 19.) and transmitted to his posterity as to his branches, the Apostle saith entred into the world by one mans sin, and so ranged over all men.

And *Origen* as I find him cited by Dr. *Willet* saith, You may call the corporal death a shadow of the other (namely a shadow of our spiritual death in sin) that wheresoever that invadeth, the other doth also necessarily follow. See Dr. *Willet* in Rom. 5. Quest. 21.

And *Theophilus* Reason doth conclude as much: By the sin

of

of *Adam* (saith he) sin and death invaded the world; namely by *Adams* first sin, original sin invaded the world, and then bodily death invaded the world by means of original sin.

P. Martyr in Rom. 5. 12. And saith *Peter Martyr*, It is much to be marvelled at, how the *Pelagians* can deny original sin in Infants, seeing they see they daily dye.

And saith *Alexander in libello fidei* c. 3. We beleeve that not onely the death of the body, which is the punishment of sin, but also that the sting of death, which is sin, entred into the world, and the Apostle testifieth that sin and death went over all men.

And saith *Bullenger* in *Decad.* 3. *Ser.* 3. By disobedience sin entred into the world, and by sin death, diseases, and all the mischiefes in the world.

Many other Orthodox Writers do confirm this for a cleer truth; That God inflicted bodily death on mans nature in general as a punishment of original sin; now if it were inflicted on man as a punishment of original sin, then it was not threatned as the immediate effect of *Adams* first sin in *Gen.* 2. 17.

And the Hebrew Doctors, as well as Christian Writers, understand the death threatned in *Gen.* 2. 17. of death in sin, and they make bodily death to be the immediate effect of it.

See *Duplessis* in *Mornay* the Trueneſſe of Religion ch. 17. By the death threatned in *Gen.* 2. 17. *Rabby Moſes Ben Maimony* understandeth a spiritual death, that is to say, the death of the soul wounded with sin, and so forsaken of her life, which is God.

And other Hebrew Doctors say that bodily death is the effect of original sin, Unto this world (say the Hebrew Rabbins cited by *Alsh.* in *Gen.* 3. 19.) there cleaveth the seed of filthinesse of the Serpent which came upon Eve, and because of that filthinesse death is come upon *Adam* and his seed.

And saith *Ainsworth* in *Gen.* 3. 15. The mystery of original sin, and thereby death over all, and of deliverance by Christ, *Rab. Menachem* on *Levit.* 5. noteth from the profound Cabalists in these words; So long as the spirit of uncleannesse is not taken away out of the world, the souls that come down into this world must needs dye, for to root out the power of uncleannesse out of the world, and to consume the same; and all this is be-

becauſe of the Decree which was decreed for the uncleanneſſe and filthineſſe which the Serpent brought upon *Eue*.

From theſe Teſtimonies it is evident that the ancient Hebrew Doctors held bodily death to be the immediate effect of original ſin; and they held original ſin to be a ſpiritual death, and to be the immediate effect of *Adams* firſt ſin.

Chryſoſtome alſo ſaith, We dye a double death, therefore we must look for a double reſurrection; Chriſt dyed but one kind of death; therefore he roſe but one kind of reſurrection; *Adam* (ſaith he) dyed body and ſoul, Firſt, he dyed to ſin; And ſecondly, to nature: *In what day ſoever ye eat of the Tree* (ſaid God) *ye ſhall dye the death*; that very day did not *Adam* dye in which he did eat, but he then dyed to ſin, and long after to nature: The firſt is the death of the ſoul; the other the death of the body; for the death of the ſoul is ſin, or everlaſting puniſhment. To us men there is a double death, and therefore we muſt have a double reſurrection: To Chriſt there was but one kind of death, for he ſinned not, and that one kind of death was for us; he owed no kind of death, for he was not ſubject to ſin, and ſo not to death. *ch.ſ.* againſt Drunkards and of the Reſurrection.

In theſe words we ſee that *Chryſoſtome* held that *Adam* firſt dyed to ſin according to *Gen.*2.17. And ſecondly, to nature, long after his death in ſin.

This Expoſition of *Gen.*2.17. I have laid down in true ſubſtance in the Dialogue in page 10. &c. and from that Expoſition, I inferred that Chriſt could not poſſible ſuffer that kind of death in our place and ſtead, for our redemption; and if this Expoſition which I have now inlarged be ſound, and according to the Context, as I beleeve it is, then the inference that I made is right and good.

But I confeſſe that upon the recein of ſome obſervations from a Reverend Divine againſt that Expoſition, I was much ſtaggered; for, as I remember he demanded this queſtion. By whoſe means was it that *Adam* dyed this ſpiritual death; was it inflicted on him by God, or rather did he not pull it upon himſelf?

This ſpeech in *Gen.*2.17 ſaid he, is no other then if it were ſaid, whenſoever thou doſt wickedly, thou ſhalt become wicked; for what is it elſe to be ſpiritually dead, but to be

devoid of goodneſſe? or whenſoever thou killeſt thy ſelf, thou ſhalt be dead; beſides (ſaith he) it is againſt the nature of God to deprive a creature of Holineſſe and Righteouſneſſe, and ſo to make it unholy, unrighteous, wicked, evill.

Theſe conſiderations, I confeſſe, did amuſe me at the preſent, my conſcience, I bleſſe God, being tender of truth, and not being able to ſatisfie my ſelf at the preſent to the contrary, I durſt not oppoſe it, and therefore I did at that preſent manifeſt my ſelf to be convinced.

But ſince then, I bleſſe God, I find ſufficient light to ſatisfie me that my firſt Expoſition in the Dialogue was right: Though I confeſſe I have found it a point of great difficulty to find out the true nature of that death in *Gen.*2.17. and to diſtinguiſh it from bodily death; and I ſee that *Mr. Baxter* doth alſo make it a Query, Whether *Adam* caſt away Gods Image, or whether God took it away from him, in his *Aphoriſmes*, page 75. but in page 34. he ſeems to hold, that after *Adam* had eaten of the forbidden fruit, he dyed ſpiritually by being forſaken of God, in regard of holineſſe, as well as in regard of comfort; and ſo he was deprived of the chief part of Gods Image; but ſo was not Chriſt, ſaith he.

And I was the more inlightned and ſupported in my Expoſition of *Gen.*2.17. by *P. Martyrs* Anſwer to *Piggius*.

See *P. Martyr* in Rom. 5. 18. Original ſin is the eſſential puniſhment of *Adams* firſt ſin though in the iſſue the Elect according to Gods eternal counſel are redeemed from it by Chriſt.

Piggius makes the corruption of our nature to be the natural effect of *Adams* ſin.

P. Martyr doth anſwer thus; The ground and reaſon thereof, is rather taken from the juſtice of God, whereby the grace of the Spirit and heavenly gift wherewith man was endowed before his fall, were removed from him when he had ſinned; and this withdrawing of grace came of the juſtice of God. Although the blame (ſaith he) be aſcribed to the Tranſgreſſion of the firſt man, leſt a man ſhould fraitway ſay that God is the cauſe of ſin; for when he had once withdrawn his gift wherewith *Adam* was adorned, fraitway vice and corruption followed of their own accord. *Tindal* alſo ſaith in page 382. The Spirit was taken away in the fall of *Adam*.

This of *Peter Martyr*, and many others to the ſame purpoſe did much ſway with me; then alſo I conſidered that *Adams* perfections were created to be but mutable, until he ſhould take

take a course for the confirmation of them by eating of the Tree of life, and therefore they were but lent him for a triall; for in case he should first eat of the Tree of knowledge of good and evill, he should dye the death, and so lose his created perfections; and therefore as soon as he had tasted by eating that forbidden fruit, God in justice took them away.

But it hath pleased God by his free promise to make himself a debtor to the Elect, for the confirmation and continuance of their faith and grace, because it was purchased for them by the blood of Christ to be of a lasting and permanent nature; but God made no such promise to *Adam* when he created him after his own Image, for he created him to be but of a mutable condition, and therefore his graces were to be continued no otherwise but upon condition only of his obedience in eating of the Tree of life in the first place; so that when the condition was broken on his part by eating the forbidden fruit, it was just with God to take away those gifts and graces wherewith he had endowed his nature at first.

In like sort at the first, God gave unto *Saul* the Spirit of Government as a new qualification added to his former education, 1 *Sam.* 10. 6. 9. But afterwards it pleased God to take away this Spirit of Government from him, because he gave it no otherwise but upon condition that he should use it for the doing of his will and command; And had he continued to use it for that end and purpose, he should still have enjoyed it; but when he abused the same to the fulfilling of his own will in sparing of *Agag*, then God took away this spirit of Government from him, and then *Saul* grew wicked, 1 *Sam.* 16. 14. And why might not God as well take away his created qualifications from *Adams* nature, for his disobedience against his positive command, as well as from *Saul* for disobedience to his positive command?

Conclusions.

1 Hence it followes, that in case this Exposition of the word Death in Gen. 2. 17. be found and good, as I conceive it is, Then Mr. *Norton* second Proposition, and all his other

Propositions, that affirm that the death threatned in *Gen.2.17.* is the inviolable rule of Gods Relative Justice, do fall to the ground.

Eternal death in hel, is but an accidental punishment to the first spiritual death.

2 Hence it follows, that the bodily death of the Elect, and both the bodily and eternal death of the Reprobate, are but accidental punishments to the first spiritual death of mans nature in sin, and therefore that the first spiritual death in sin was the essential and substantial curse that was first threatned in *Gen.2.17.* or thus, *Adams* disobedience was the meritorious cause of the death of mans nature in sin; & the spiritual death of mans nature in sin was (afterwards) the meritorious cause of bodily death, though God was pleased to sanctifie that punishment to all that do beleeve in the Promised Seed, and now through faith they have hope in their death to change for the better, but the said bodily death was ordained for a further degree of misery to all that beleeve not in the Promised Seed; for when God ordained death, he ordained judgement to succeed it, *Heb.9.27.* and this is the distribution of his judgement, *He that beleeveth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that beleeveth not the Son, shall not see life; But the wrath of God abideth on him,* Joh.3.36.

3 Hence it follows, that the inviolable rule of Gods relative Justice for mans Redemption is not to be fetched from *Gen.2.17.* but from the voluntary cause of Gods secret will not yet revealed to *Adam* till after his fall; and that secret will (but now revealed) was that the formality of Christs death in seperating his soul from his body by his own Priestly power should be a sacrifice, and the formality of all satisfaction, as it is explained in *Heb.9.15, 16.* and *Heb.10.*

4 I desire the Reader to take notice that I defer my Examination of Mr. *Nottons* Exposition of *Gen.2.17.* to Chap.10.

His fifth Proposition is this.

Merit is either absolute, so God cannot be a debtor to the creature, nor to Christ himself, or by way of free Covenant; so God in case hath made himself a debtor to man. Justice then consisting in rendring to every one their due, and Gods will being the rule of Justice, it followeth,

that,

that, and onely that to be the due desert, merit, or demerit of man, which God hath willed concerning him.

Reply. He saith Gods will being the rule of justice; this's true, if it be taken for his secret will; for it is his secret, and not his revealed will that is the inviolable rule of his relative justice; God may, and often doth free a sinner from his revealed, threatned punishments, upon such account as himself pleased to decree in the counsel of his own will, and yet he is just in so doing, though his revealed will be contrary; and the reason is plain, because he hath ordained his secret will to be the absolute rule of his inviolable relative justice; for God is often said to repent of his revealed threatned plagues, as I have shewed in Chap. 10. Sect. 1. and in Chap. 25. Sect. 2. at Eighthly.

His further composition is this.

The demerit or desert of man by reason of sin, being death according to relative justice; the rule of proceeding between God and him; Justice now requireth that man should dye (as God with reverence be it spoken of him who cannot be unjust) in case man had continued in obedience, had been unjust if he had denied him life; so in case of disobedience he should be unjust in case he should not inflict death.

Reply. Take this Proposition in relation to *Adams* mutable condition wherein he was created, unto which the promise and threatning of the first Covenant hath immediate relation; and then experience tells us that the threatning in case of *Adams* disobedience was executed, and so in case he had first eaten of the Tree of life, God should have been unjust if he had not confirmed him in his present created perfections.

But Mr. *Norton* it seems takes this promise and threatning chiefly to intend either eternal life in heaven, or eternal death in hell; as if *Adam* had been immediately under the threatning of hell-torments, and that there is no other way to redeem him from them, unlesse Christ stood as his Surety in the same obligation with him to bear them. But the Reader may

please to see my Reply to his Exposition of *Gen.* 2.17. in Chap. 10. and in other places I have often Replied to *Gen.* 2.17. as you may see by the Table to that Scripture.

But as touching Gods promises of salvation, and his threatning of damnation, there is not the same reason of Gods performing promises and threatnings; for mans happinesse is contained in the promises, and therefore man performing the condition, God cannot but will the reward; the same will that wills the making of the promise must necessarily will the giving of the reward promised, the condition being performed, otherwise it would be vain, and of no use for God to make promises to man: But as for threatnings which concern mans destruction, there is no such tye upon God (unlesse his threatnings be delivered with an oath) and therefore man will not, and cannot complain if they be not executed; and if God will rather glorifie his mercy in remitting the punishment, upon what account he thought best in the Counsel of his own Will, who can say he is unjust? mercy herein rejoyceth against judgement. See also my note on *Psal.* 94.15.

His seventh Proposition is this.

The Elect then having sinned, the Elect must dye; if they dye for their own persons, election is frustrate, God is unfaithful; if they dye not at all, God is unjust, the commination is untrue: If elect men dye in their own person, the Gospel is void; if man doth not dye, the Law is void, they dye therefore in the man Christ Jesus, who satisfied justice as their Surety, and so fulfilled both Law and Gospel, &c.

Reply. My former Exposition of *Gen.* 2.17. in Sect. 3. is a sufficient confutation of this Proposition; but Mr. *Norton* goes another way in his opening of that text, and of that threatning, and yet he doth not prove, but beg the question, and then he makes his inferences: The Elect then (saith he) having sinned, must dye; he takes not this death for death in sin, as the truth is, but he takes it principally for eternal death in hell: I say, in this sense his Proposition is not true; for God never willed that the Elect should dye an eternal death; (in his fifth Proposition, he said, Gods will was the rule of his relative justice)

justice) and yet he willed that the Reprobate should consequently dy an eternal death in the same threatning, in case they did not imbrace the mercy offered by the promised Seed. What God intended by that threatning is now evident to us by experience, namely, that the Reprobate should dye a spiritual death in sin, and after that a corporal, and after that an eternal death; and that the Elect should dye a spirituil death in sin as well as the Reprobate, and that after that they should have a new nature by the promised Seed, and after that should dye a corporal death, but yet that the Elect should be freed from eternal death upon such terms as were mutually agreed on betwixt the Trinity; and that the remains of their spiritual death, and also that their corporal death, and all other punishments that should be inflicted on them for sin, should by Gods infinite mercy and wisdome be turned to their good for the glorifying of his free grace and rich mercy.

And it was just with God to do according to this his will, and therefore Mr. *Newtons* conclusion of this Proposition (confutes his former part) as Gods will is the rule of righteousnesse: So Gods will is the rule of the temperature of righteousnesse. The plain English of it must needs be this, That in as much as it was the will of God not to execute the threatning of eternal death strictly upon the Elect, but to moderate it, and to suffer Sathan to inflict something only contained in it upon their Mediator, by piercing him in the foot-soals at the same time when the seed of the Woman should break his Head-plot, by making his soul a sacrifice for sin, as the price of their Redemption for the glory of his grace. This being the will of God, it must needs be just, as well as it was just for him to execute all that was contained in the threatning upon the Reprobates.

His eighth Proposition.

Though God by his absolute power might have saved man without a Surety; yet having constituted that inviolable rule of relative justice, In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely dye, Gen. 2.17. *he could not avoid, in respect of his power now limited, to proceed by this rule; But man having sinned, man must dye, and satisfie the Law that man may live, &c.*

Reply.

Reply. In that Christ did dye for the Elect, it did not come to passe from a necessity of justice in respect of that first threatning; But because it pleased God out of his infinite wisdome, and free grace in the voluntary Covenant between the Trinity to will it, and to accept of his death and sacrifice as the price of their Redemption, *Heb.* 10. 5, 7. *Eph.* 1. 7, 8. And Mr. *Norton* himself in his answer to his first Query, doth acknowledge that vindicative justice hath no necessary connexion with the being of God, but is an act of Gods good pleasure.

Secondly, He takes it often for grace (which is as often denied) that Christ was *seddans* Surety in the same obligation to the first Covenant.

Thirdly, His conclusion that God could not avoid in respect of his power now limited to proceed by this Rule; namely, that man sinned, man must dye in the man Christ Jesus; I have shewed in Chap. 6. and Chap. 10. that this kind of reasoning is a meer *Paralogisme*, namely, a deceitful *Sylogisme*, which seemeth true when it is not.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

The Examination of Mr. Nortons *third Query in* Page 5. *which is this.*

Wherein consists the sufficiency and value of the obedience of Christ as our Surety?

Ans. In three things { 1 *In the dignity of his person obeying,* 2 *In the quality or kind of his obedience,* 3 *In the acceptation of this obedience.*

SECT. 1.

Reply 1 THere is no need to say any thing to the first branch of his Answer.

But to the second branch, touching the quality or kind of his obedience, there is need of examination; for Mr. *Norton* makes all the obedience of Christ to be legal obedience, in opposition to the Dialogue that doth distinguish between his Legal and Mediatorial obedience.

In page 6. Mr. *Norton* saith, *His obedience was legal obedience, the same in nature and measure which we by the first Covenant stood bound unto.*

But I have shewed in Chap. 2. Sect. 1. That the true nature of the first Covenant did not stand in *Adams* obedience, or disobedience to the moral Law of nature, but in his obedience, or disobedience to a positive Law, about things indifferent in their own nature; and from Mr. *Rutherfurd*, that the Command of God for Christ to dye, was not from the moral Law, but from a positive Law only.

The kind of Christs obedience as Mediator, was to a peculiar positive law. But Mr. Norton doth 1 affirm that the quality or kind of Christs obedience was legal; and 2 he doth contradict that, and saith it was more also.

Reply 2. Mr. *Norton* doth also contradict himself touching the quality or kind of Christs obedience; For first, he saith, It was legal, the same in nature and measure which we by the first Covenant stood bound unto. But secondly, he contradicts this, for in page 201. he saith, That the will of God concerning the Mediator, was, that he should obey the Law of Works, *& more*. This last word *more* is a contradiction of what he said formerly: If his obedience was more then Legal obedience, then his obedience was not the same in nature and measure, which we by the first Covenant stood bound unto (for he understands the first Covenant to be made according to the moral Law) and to confute himself the more manifestly, he brings in *Paræus* and *Rivet* in the former page, to prove that Christs obedience as Mediator, was more then legal. *Paræus* asserting a special obedience imposed on the Mediator alone, and *Rivet*, a singular command of laying down his life, from *Joh.*10.18.

Now let the Reader judge, especially such as are acquainted with *Paræus* judgement, whether that special obedience which was imposed on the Mediator alone, be no other then legal obedience, or whether it be the same in nature and measure which we in the first Covenant stood bound unto, according to Mr. *Nortons* sense of that Covenant.

And secondly, let the Reader also judge whether it be possible for Mr. *Norton* to make a true description of the true nature of Christs satisfaction, while he is thus confounded in the nature of Christs obedience as Mediator.

SECT. 2.

In page 140. He calls the Dialogues distinction of Christs Legal and Mediatorial obedience, *A new Law, and a new Mediatorly obedience conformable to that new Law.* And in page 108. He calls this distinction, *An erronious, and mis-leading distinction.*

Reply. WHether Mr. *Norton* will own this distinction or no, the matter will be the lesse with a judicious Reader, because it hath the approbation of many eminent ortho-

orthodox Divines (besides *Pareus* and *Rivet*) who do ground the said distinction, on these, and the like Scriptures, *Joh.*10.18. *Joh.*14.31. *Joh.*17.4. *Heb.*10.7,9,10. *Psal.*40.7,8. *Rom.*5.19. *Phil.*2.8. *Es.*53.10.

Heb 10 7.

1 It is disputed saith Mr. *Burges*, Whether Christ had a command laid upon him by the Father, strictly so called; and howsoever (saith he) the *Arians* from the grant of this did infer Christs absolute inferiority to his Father; yet (saith he) our orthodox Divines do conclude it, because of the many places of Scripture which prove it.

In Vindiciæ legis lect. 1 *p.* 13. See also *Blake* on the Covenant, p. 25.

2 Mr. *Gataker* doth place the merit of Christs obedience and satisfaction wholly in this kind of Mediatorly obedience, and not in his legal obedience, for thus he answers to *Bar. Wegiline* (that holds to Christs legal obedience for merit as Mr. *Norton* doth) *Non est necesse ut Christus legis moralis sive naturalis placita implendo, vel sibi, vel nobis quicquam fuerit promeritus, non magis quam ut Angeli, qua creatura rationalis unaquæque creationis ipsius nomine Deo creatori ex officio debeat quicquid lex illa à quoquam exigit.*

Bartho. Wegil. Sangalensis, in his Ans. to the 5 Reason of the 13 Thesis.

In English thus:

It is not necessary that Christ in fulfilling the moral and natural Law should deserve any thing for himself, or us, no more then the Angels; seeing every rational creature in the very name of its creation, ows all things on duty to its Creator whatsoever the Law requires of any; and he doth fully manifest his judgement in his Elenchtick Animadversions upon *Gomarus*, *p.*1. *Thes.*1.*p.*15. *Thes.*8.*p.*17. *Thes.*9. *p.*19. *Thes.*11. *p.*25. *Thes.*15. *p.*49. *Thes.*32. And in his Animadversions upon the disputes betwixt *Piscator* and *Lucius*, in the meritorious cause of our justification, *Partis primæ Sect.*1.*p.*2.12. *Sect.*4.*p.*18. *Sect.*6.*numero* 4.*p.*19. *Sect.*7.*numero* 1. *Partis secundæ p.*57. *Sect.*2. *numero* 16.70. *Sect.*8. *numero* 6. And there he gives this reason, because Christ performed moral obedience for himself, and not for us.

3 *Pareus* saith, That those that ascribe the merit of righteousnesse unto Christs active obedience, or to his native holinesse, do thereby derogate from the death of Christ, and do undoubtedly make it vain or superfluous. *Pareus* doth often use this Argument, and Mr. *Gataker* doth as often approve it,

De Justitiâ Christi activâ & passivâ, *p.* 101, 102. and in his Epist. to *Whitgensteinius*.

not only in his disputation with *Gomarus*, but also in his answer to Mr. *Walkers* Vindication, in p. 13. 91. 107. 136. and when he had repeated *Pareus* his words in p. 13. he speaks thus to Mr. *Walker*, Now would I gladly understand from Mr. *Walker* what he thinketh of *Pareus*, whether he count not him a blasphemous Heretick as well as Mr. *Wotton*? The same question do I propound to Mr. *Norton*, together with that crosse interrogatory that Mr. *Gataker* propounded to Mr. *Walker* in p. 90. 91.

In his Book of the heart of Christ in Heaven, p. 50, 51. Psal. 40. 8.

3 Mr. *Thomas Goodwin* saith, That the Law which Christ saith was in his heart or bowels, *Psal.* 40. 8. was that special Law which lay upon him, as he was the second *Adam* (namely it was a positive Law) like that which was given to the first *Adam*, *non comedendi*, over and above the moral Law, not to eat of the forbidden fruit, such a Law was this (which was given to the Mediator) it was the Law of his being a Mediator and a Sacrifice, over and besides the moral Law which was common to him with us; and saith he, as that special law of not eating the forbidden fruit was unto *Adam Præceptum Symbolicum* (as Divines call it) given over and besides all the ten Commandements, to be a trial or symbol of his obedience to all the rest, such was this Law given to Christ the second *Adam*, and thus he expounds the word Law in *Psal.* 40. 8. of the peculiar Law of Mediatorship, just as the Dialogue doth, and not of the moral Law as Mr. *Norton* doth.

4 Mr. *Rutherfurd* saith, that Christs obedience in laying down his life, was in obedience to a positive Law, and not to the moral Law, as I have cited him more at large in Chap. 2. Sect. 1.

5 Mr. *Job. Goodwin* doth cite divers eminent Divines that do distinguish the obedience of Christ into two kinds, the one they call *Justitia personæ*, the righteousnesse of his person, the other *Justitia meriti*, the righteousnes of merit; and for this distinction, he cites *Pareus*, Dr. *Prideaux*, Mr. *Bradshaw*, Mr. *Forbs*, and Mr. *Gataker*, and *Justitia personæ* they place in *Causa sine qua non*.

Christs obedience to the moral Law, is called by Divines, *Justitia personæ*, but his obedience in his death and sufferings, they call *Justitia meriti*.

6 Saith Mr. *Baxter*, many learned and godly Divines, of singular esteem in the Church of God, are of this judgement. In his *Pos.* of *Just.* p. 53. and there he names many, and, saith he, in his late Apologie to Mr. *Blake*, p. 115. I deny not but that Christ as man was under a Law, yea and a Law peculiar to himself, whereto

whereto no other creature is subject, even the Law of Mediation, which deserves in the body of *Theologie* a peculiar place, and the handling of it as distinct from all the Laws made with us men, is of speciall use &c.

SECT. 3.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 192. *The Death of the Mediator was in a way of Justice, and was Legal obedience*; And in the same page, he makes the Incarnation of Christ also, *to be legal obedience.*

Christs obedience in his Incarnation and Death, was not moral obedience, but Mediatorial obedience to the special Law of Mediatorship.

Reply 1. IT seems that Mr. *Norton* holds, That God had ordained no other way to take satisfaction, but first by our Saviours performing of legal obedience for us, and suffering the essential punishment of hell torments, for this way only he calls, The way of Justice: But in the former Section, I have shewed that sundry orthodox, whereof some of them do hold as Mr. *Norton* doth, that Christ made satisfaction by suffering hell torments, as *Pareus* and Mr. *Rutherfurd*, and yet they deny that Christs obedience in his death was legal obedience, contrary to Mr. *Norton*.

Ball on the Covenant, p. 281.

2 I will adde Mr. *Ball* to them, for he held that Christ made satisfaction by suffering the wrath of God, (though in page 290. he seems not to hold that he suffered hell torments) and yet he also doth exempt the death of Christ from being any part of legal obedience. The Law (saith he) did not require that God should dye, nor that any should dye that had not sinned, nor such a death, and of such efficacy, as not only to abolish death, but to bring in life by many degrees more excellent then that which *Adam* lost.

See *Ball* on the Covenant, p. 259.

And saith Mr. *Ball*, Christ upon the Crosse prayed for them that crucified him, *Luke* 23.34. But (saith he) that might be of private duty, as man, who subjected himself to the Law of God, which requires that we forgive our enemies, and pray for them that persecute us; not of the proper office of a Mediator, which was to offer up himself a sacrifice, who was to intercede for his people by suffering death. It behoved Christ as he subjected himself to the Law, to fulfill all Righteousnesse,

and to pray for his enemies, but that was not out of his proper office as Mediator.

Hence the Reader may observe, that Mr. *Ball* makes Christs obedience to the moral Law to bee out of private duty, as a man, and not *ex officio*, out of the proper office of a Mediator, as Mr. *Norton* doth make all his legal obedience to be.

And saith he in page 287. Christ was Lord of his own life, and therefore had power to lay it down, and take it up. And this power he had (though he were in all points subject to the Law as we are) not solely by vertue of the hypostatical union (which did not exempt him from any obligations of the Law) but by vertue of a particular Command, Constitution, and Designation to that service of laying down his life. *This Commandement have I received of my Father*, Joh. 10. 18.

In Appendix to his Pos. p. 128.

3 Saith *Baxter*, The Law of the Creature, and the Law of the Mediator are in several things different: The will of his Father which hee came to do, consisted in many things which were never required of us: And such (saith he) are all the works that are proper to the office of Mediatorship.

Upon *Gomarus* p 25. Heb. 10. 10.

4 Mr. *Gataker* in his *Elenchtick Animad.* upon *Gomarus*, doth thus expound *Heb.* 10. 10. *I come to do thy will*; By which Will wee are sanctified through the oblation of his body, &c.

That Will (saith he) is the Stipulation (or Covenant) of the Father about Christs undertaking our cause upon himself, and performing those things that were requisite for the Expiation of our sins, therefore it comprehends all the obedience of Christ which he performed to the peculiar Law of Mediation; for this Law set apart, he was not bound by any other Law to the oblation of himself. And hence it follows, that if Christ made satisfaction by his obedience to another Covenant, then not by his obedience to the moral Law.

5 If God had commanded Christ to dye by the Justice of the moral Law, then his desire, *That the Cup might passe from him*, in *Matth.* 26. 39. had been a sinful desire; But, saith Mr. *Rutherford*, because it was a positive Law only by which God commanded him to dye, therefore that desire was no sin, as I have noted his words more at large in Chap. 2. Sect. 1.

6 Saith Mr. *Thomas Goodwin*, The death of Christ was not com-

manded by the moral Law; but it was commanded over and besides the moral Law, as I cited him in the former Section.

7 It seems that Mr. *Norton* hath an art (beyond others) by which hee can make the miraculous work of Christs Incarnation to be moral obedience, or else he would never say, as hee doth, That the Incarnation of Christ was an act of legal obedience, in page 192.

If the Incarnation of Christ had been an act of obedience to the moral Law, then Christs God-head had been in an absolute inferiority to his Fathers supreme Command.

The *Arians* will be much beholding to him for this Tenent; for if his Incarnation which was an act of his God-head, was an act of his obedience to the moral Law; then it follows, that the God-head of Christ was in an absolute subjection, and so in an absolute inferiority to his Father; for the moral Law is supreme compulsory Law given to inferiors.

But Mr. *Norton* labours to prove, *That the Incarnation of Christ was an act of legal obedience*, in page 192. by *Gal.* 4. 4. and in page 196. (saith he) *Christ was subject to the Law not as man only, but as God-man Mediator*, Gal. 4. 4, 5. And saith he in the same page, *The Law wherein he was subject, is the Law wherunto wee are subject.*

Reply. His proof from *Gal.* 4. 4. I will now examine, because he doth cite it to prove that the moral Law was given to the Mediator, as the Law of his Mediatorship, as in page 103. 192, 196, 197, 200, 240, 267.

The sense of this Text must bee sought out by comparing it with the Context; the third verse runs thus, *Even so we, when we were children, were in bondage under the Elements* (or Rudiments) *of the world.* Hence the Apostle infers, in vers. 4, 5. *But when the fulnesse of the time was come, God sent forth his Son made of a woman, made under the Law, to redeem them that were under the Law.*

Any man that hath but half an eye, may see that the Apostle in this place speaks only of the ceremonial Law (by which it appears that Mr. *Norton* took but little heed to the Context) and therefore it is sufficient to answer him in the words of Mr. *Gataker* to the seventh Reason of *Wigelius* his 19. *Thesis*: This place (to the *Galatians*, saith he, speaks of the Law of Rites, theree-

therefore it comes not here to bee handled (namely not in Mr. *Nortons* sense) for Mr. *Norton* saith, *That the Law here whereunto Christ was made subject, is the Law whereunto wee are made subject.* But Mr. *Gataker*, according to the Context, doth call it the Law of Rites, and Dr. *Hammond* doth Analyze the Text to that sense onely; And so doth Mr. *Ball* on the Covenant, page 141. and 166.

But for the better clearing of this sense, I will expound the severall branches of *Gal.*4.4.

1 *When the fulnesse of time was come*: This *fulnesse of time*, must be understood chiefly of the time of Christs death, though it doth also comprehend the time of his Incarnation, namely in order to his death; for untill that full time of Christs death, the Jews were under ceremonial Types, as under Tutors and Governors: And the exact period of this full time was fore-told unto *Daniel* by the Angel *Gabriel*, just four hundred and
Dan.9.24,27. ninety years before-hand, for saith *Daniel* in Chap.9.21. *The Angel* Gabriel *came flying swiftly, and touched me, at I was at prayers about the time of the Evening Oblation*; and in vers.22. he said, *O* Daniel *I am come forth to give thee skill and understanding* (namely of the fulnesse of time appointed of the Father) *therefore understand the matter, and consider the Vision, for seventy weeks are determined* (Dan.9.24.) *upon thy people, and upon thy holy City, to finish trespass* (namely, to finish Trespasse-offerings) *and to end Sins* (namely, to end Sin-offerings) *and to make reconciliation for Unrighteousnesse, and to bring in everlasting Righteousnesse*; instead of Ceremonial Righteousnesse by legal purifications, and by legal Reconciliations and Attonements by the blood of Bulls and Goats, and the Ashes of an Heifer, sprinkling the unclean to the purifying of the flesh, *Heb.*9.13. this kind of Righteousnesse was but a figure for the present time, that could not make holy, concerning the conscience, him that did the service, *Heb.* 9.9. *For it is not possible that the blood of Bulls and Goats should take away* (moral) *sins*, Heb.10 4. But the Sacrifice of Christ (which was typified by these Rites being made in the fulnesse of that time that was fore-appointed of the Father) had a true vertue and efficacie, by vertue of Gods Covenant with the Mediator, to cleanse the conscience from the guilt of moral sins, and to bring in a moral Righteousnesse, and so then the ceremonial Right-

See *Broughtons* Translation printed at *Hanaw.*

Righteousnesse must cease; and thus the Angel *Gabriel* told *Daniel*, that the Messiah by his death should make reconciliation for unrighteousnesse, and so bring in an Everlasting Righteousnesse; and then saith the Angel *Gabriel* in vers. 27. He shall confirm the Testament for the many, the last Seven, when in half that Seven, he shall end Sacrifice and Oblation; The words are thus opened by *Paul*, in *Heb.*9.26. But now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin, namely to put away the Ceremonial use of Sin-offerings by the sacrifice of himself; and in *Rom.*8.3. *God sending his own Son in the likenesse of sinful flesh, and for his sacrifice for sin in the flesh, Hee condemned sin*, that is to say, the use of Sin-offerings; because his Sin-offering was of efficacy sufficient to make an Everlasting Reconciliation, and Redemption, and to bring in an Everlasting Purifying from sin, which *Daniel* calls an Everlasting Righteousnesse. And thus in the fulnesse of time, God sent his Son to fulfill the Ceremonial Law of Types; and then it follows, that all Ceremonial Types must cease, &c. And thus Christ hath redeemed us for our moral sins, and from the moral curse; and this is worth the noting, that the Levitical Ordinances are in Greek called *Justifications*, in *Heb.*9.1. and Carnal Justifications in verse 10. because they represented our Justification, saith *Dickson*, namely such Justifications as were made by Ceremonial Cleansings, such as I have formerly named in *Heb.*9.13. and also the cleansing of the Temple, *Dan.*8.14. is called *Tzedek*, justified, and such Ceremonial Purifyings did typifie Gods moral justification by his being reconciled or attoned to sinners for the sake of Christs sin-offering; and therefore when the Jews were cleansed according to the purification of the Sanctuary, they said to the Porters of the Temple, in *Psal.*118.19. *Open to me the gates of Righteousnesse, I will go in to praise the Lord*, called the gates of Justice, saith *Ainsw.* because only the just & clean might enter into them. And in verse 20. *This is the gate of the Lord, into which the righteous shall enter*; namely such as are legally righteous by being purified from their Ceremonial sins; which was a type of the true nature of our moral justification; And in this respect, the Temple is also called, *The habitation of justice*, Jer. 50.7. for such purified persons as came thither, were justified persons as to the outward man, yea all the Nation in this respect

Heb.9.26.

Rom.8.3.

Dan.8.14. Heb.9.1.10. Legal justification was a type of our moral justification.

Psal.118.19.

are holy, *Exod.* 19. and therefore any of *Israel*, though never so vild by moral sins, yet if they were but legally cleansed from their ceremonial sins, they might lawfully appear before God in his Sanctuary, as justified persons in regard of that place; but on the contrary, if any man, though never so godly (and therefore morally justified) did but want this ceremonial cleansing, they were unjustified persons in respect of their bodily appearance in Gods Sanctuary, and were guilty of cutting off by death, *Lev.*15.31. *Num.*19.13. so then, their outward legal cleansing from their ceremonial sins, the Ordinances of the ceremonial Law, was but to typifie their true justification by the death of Christ in the fulnesse of time, as the procuring cause of Gods cleansing by his free pardon and forgivenesse, as in *Jer.*33.8. *I will cleanse them from all their iniquity whereby they have sinned against me, and I will pardon all their iniquities whereby they have sinned, and whereby they have transgressed against me.* Here cleansing is put for justification by forgivenesse. And so in *Ezek.*36.25. *Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthinesse, and from all your Idols will I cleanse you.* And in vers. 29. *I will save you from all your uncleannesses.* These places do allude to the ceremonial purgations afore cited from *Heb.* 9.13. and in this sense the bloody death of Christ which he offered in the fulnesse of time doth purge us, *Heb.*1.3. and cleanse us, *Tit.*2.14. 1 *Joh.*1.7. and wash us from our sins, *Rev.*1.5. because it procures God the Fathers Attonement, which doth formally expiate sin, cleanse it, purge it, and wash it away. See *Ainsw.* in *Exod.* 30.10. *Lev.*16.30,33. *Numb.*8.7,21. *Numb.*19.9. *Psal.*51.7. *So that to them that are in Christ there is no condemnation,* Rom.8.1.

Jer.33.8.

2 The second sentence of this vers. of *Gal.*4.4. is this:

God sent forth his Son.

This word *sent*, implies that there had a mutual Covenant passed between the Trinity, or else the Father could not have sent him forth; for the Father had no supreme Authority over his Son, because they are in nature equal, *Joh.*10.30. and therefore can have but one will and content, which may be called a Covenant: *I came down from Heaven* (said Christ) *not to do mine own* (humane) *will, but the will of him that sent me,* Joh. 6.38.

3 *Made of a woman*; For according to *Gen.*3,15. Hee was made of the seed of the woman, by the mighty power of the Holy Ghost *Luke* 1.35.

4 *Made under the Law*: Being made of a woman, that was a Jew, he was made under the Law of Types.

5 *That he might redeem them that were under the Law*: But hee could not redeem any from the bondage of *Moses* Rites, untill hee had fulfilled all the Types, by his own blessed death and sacrifice, in the fulnesse of the time that was fore-appointed of the Father; and by that act he hath both redeemed us from the bondage of *Moses* Rites, and also hath redeemed us morally from the displeasure of God, and from Sathans Head-ploe.

It is true also that he fulfilled the moral Law as he was true man, and also that he fulfilled the preceptive part of *Moses* Rites in his own practice, but that he did as he was a Jew only: but he fulfilled the Types as hee was a Mediator only, by his death and sacrifice; and by that fulfilling he hath redeemed us, both from the bondage of *Moses* Rites, and also from Sathans Head-ploe.

And thus we may see, that the Types of the ceremonial Law, especially those Laws of Priests and Sacrifice, were ordained to typifie the Law of Mediatorship, and our moral justification by him; Therefore all such as are desirous to see more fully into the true matter and form of that Covenant between the Trinity for mans redemption, let them study the mysteries of *Moses* Ceremonies; for in them as in a glasse they may behold the several Articles of the Eternal Covenant for mans Redemption; and therefore when Christ came into the world, he said, *Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me* (in place of Types) *then said I, Lo I come to do thy will, O God*, by the doing of which will we are sanctified, namely purged, purified, or cleansed from sin, as the legal phrase is explained in *Heb.*9. 13. Of which Ceremonial putifying, see *Alsted* in Exod.29.36. but metaphorically it signified the expiation of all sin through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.

The ceremonial Types of cleansing, especially of Priest and Sacrifice, did typifie our moral justification or cleansing from all sin by Christs Sacrifice in procuring Gods Atonement. Heb 9.13.

To cleanse men from sins meerly Ceremonial, the bloody sacrifice of brute beasts was sufficient by Gods own Ordi-

nance, *Heb.9.13.* and hence the Apostle infers in *vers.14. How much more shall the blood of Christ?* This inference of the Apostle doth not consist simply in this, namely in the super-excellency of this High-priest above the Legal-priest in *vers.11.* nor in the super-excellency of his blood, as *vers.12.* but in the super-excellency of this High-priest and his sacrifice united personally, as *vers.14. How much more, &c.* Suppose a Priest as excellent had been found, and also a Sacrifice as excellent, in two distinct persons, yet that had not been effectual for satisfaction, because it could not comprise the act of one Mediator; but the admirable personal union of this High-priest and Sacrifice, did comprise the act of one Mediator, for so (saith the Text, he offered himself by his Eternal Spirit, namely by his God-head, and for this cause hee is the Mediator of the New Testament, *vers.15.* and hence it had its vertue to cleanse you from the guilt of all manner of sin.

And secondly, hence it had vertue to confirm the Testament for the many, as it is expressed in *vers.15,16,17.*

Thirdly, I had almost forgotten to parallel that speech in *Dan.9.27.* with *Gal. 4.4,5.* which lyes thus.

He shall confirm the Testament for the Many, the last Seven, that is to say, in the very end of the last Seven, which is most precisely called *The fulnesse of time*, in *Gal.4.4.*

Now where a Testament is confirmed, there must of necessity be the death of the Testator; for a Testament is confirmed, and of force, after men be dead, it is of no strength at all whilst the Testator lives, *Heb.9.16,17.*

The next clause in *Daniel*, is this:

And in the half of that Seven (which is three years and a half) namely in the end of this last half of the last Seven, which also is most precisely called, *The fulnesse of time*, in *Gal.4.4. he shall end Sacrifice and oblation*; and this speech is directly parallel to that in *Gal.4.4,5. He shall redeem them from under the Law*; that is to say, by one and the same act of his Death and Sacrifice, he shall end Sacrifice and Oblation; and by that act he shall redeem us not only from the bondage of *Moses* Ceremonies, but also from Sathans Head-plot; or as it is in *vers.24.* By his death, *He shall finish Trespasse-offering, and end Sin-offerings, and so make reconciliation for unrighteousnesse, and bring in an everlasting Righteousnesse;*

for

for he shall confirm unto us all the Legacies of the New Testament, by his death, where the Spirit for regeneration, and forgivenesse of sin for Justification, are the general Legacies.

Thus have I shewed (though not so compendiously as I could wish) that the word *Law*, in *Gal.*4.4. must bee understood of the ceremonial Law only; And therefore first, All that *Mr. Norton* saith touching Christs subjection to the moral Law, from *Gal.*4.4. as the proper Law of his Mediatorship there intended, falls to the ground. And secondly, his charge of the second Heresie which he proveth from this Text, doth justly fall upon his own head; for this is certain, that if a Curse be not justly given, it shal not come on the innocent, *Prov.*26,27. but it must return to the giver, *Psal.*109.17. Thirdly, Hence it follows, that *Mr. Norton* doth again most grosly wrong this Text to prove that Christ suffered the curse of hell torments in his death, in p.203.

The last branch of *Mr. Nortons* third Query is this:

In the Acceptation of this Obedience?

Reply 4. This Acceptation *Mr. Norton* takes for granted, which is denied.

He should have proved, as well as affirmed, that God accepted of Christs legal obedience, as our obedience (then hee had shewed his skill) and then it had indeed been meritorious, and of such value and sufficiency; But because hee doth but barely affirm it, therefore I shall passe it by without any further examination here, because I have shewed the contrary in the former section, and also in Chap.2. Sect.11.

His fourth Query is a bare Affirmation;

And the reason of the denial I will shew, when I come to examine his Exposition of *Gen.*2.17.

CHAP. IV.

The Examination of Mr. Nortons *first Distinction, in* Page 7. which is this:

Distinguish between the Essential or Substantial, and the Accidental or Circumstantial parts of the punishment of the Curse.

And then he makes this to be the distinguishing Character between them.

The Essential part of the punishment (saith he) *is that execution of Justice, which proceedeth from the Curse considered absolutely in it self, without any respect to the condition or disposition of the Patient.*

The Accidental part of the punishment (saith he) *is that execution of Justice which proceedeth not from the Curse considered absolutely, but from the disposition of the Patient being under such a Curse.*

SECT. 1.

Reply 1. THis Distinction hee takes for granted; for hee shews not how, or in what sense any of these accidental parts do flow from the disposition, or condition of the Patient under the curse, further then by two Humane and Civil Resemblances of his meaning.

But the Dialogue gave him a fair occasion, to clear his meaning, by objecting sundry particulars of the Curse, and instead of a fair answer, hee puts the Reader off with this sleight;

sleight. The reasoning of the Dialogue is impertinent; The dispute is about the Essential parts of the Curse, these are but Accidental, because they proceed not from the Curse absolutely considered, but from the disposition or condition of the Patient under the curse.

Now seeing he doth thus hide his meaning, How can I, or the Reader judge what weight of truth there is in his distinction? let the Reader judge whether such unexplained distinctions bee not rather evasions than explications.

SECT. 2.

YOu may see it, saith Mr. Norton, exemplified in Civil punishments; in the execution of death upon a Malefactor, the separation of the soul from the body is of the essence of punishment: The gradual decay of the senses, impotency of spirits, are accidental parts of the punishment.

Or thus (saith he) it may be further illustrated in the case of the execution of imprisonment upon a Debtor; imprisonment it of the essence of punishment, but duration in prison is from the disposition of the Debtor, namely his insufficiency to pay the debt.

Reply 1. All the sufferings of Christ were to bee performed from the voluntary cause, being founded in Gods good will and pleasure, and agreed on by a mutual and reciptocal Covenant between the Trinity, and not from the natural order of Court-proceedings; but Mr. *Norton* doth exemplifie all this from the natural order of Court-justice: It is all one as if he should exemplifie the Incarnation and the Death of Christ by the natural order of our conception and death: It is a known maxim, That paralleling of justice between cases Divine and Humane, is dangerous, and from Humane to Divine is an unsafe way of reasoning, and savors too much of prying into the secrets of God, contrary to *Deut.* 29. 29. and of too much boldnesse in giving a reason of Gods eternal decrees, which is not modesty in the creature. *Rom.* 11. 33.

The natural order of proceedings in Courts of justice is not fit to exemplifie the order of proceedings in voluntary citules and Covenants.

But Mr. *Norton* seems to father this opinion and distinction on Dr. *Ames* in his Answer to *Bellarmine* about the Eternity of Hell-torments in Christs sufferings (as his marginal Note shews);

shews.) But the self-same Dr. *Ames* in his *Marrow, lib. 1. c. 36. Sect. 4, 7, 9.* doth expresse himself to bee of another mind touching the Eternity of Hell-torments; hee doth there make the Eternity of duration to be as Essential as the Extremity of pain, both in respect of losse and sense; and in *Sect.* 5. hee renders three Reasons of this Eternity.

Eternity is essential to the Torments of Hell.

1 Because of the eternal abiding of the Offence.

2 Because of the unchangeablenesse of the condition which that degree of punishment doth incur.

3 Because of the want of satisfaction.

Now compare Dr. *Ames* at one time when he doth plainly lay down the grounds of Divinity, with Dr. *Ames* at another time when hee is pinched to answer *Bellarmines* Argument, and then you may finde him not well to accord with himself.

Yea Mr. *Norton* himself gives another reason of the duration of Hell punishments, besides inability to satisfie sooner.

The reason (saith he) why eternal death is inflicted after the separation of the soul from the body, is chiefly, because this bodily death puts a period to our capacity of having any part in the first Resurrection, namely of Regeneration, whereby only the second death is prevented, and I may also adde, whereby its eternity is prevented. This reason which Mr. *Norton* hath here given, makes Eternity essential to Hell-torments.

The distinction of essential and circumstantial Hell-torments, whereby to make Eternity no more but a circumstance, hath foure inconveniences attending it.

This distinction of essential and circumstantial Hell-torments, whereby hee labours to make Eternity to bee no more but a circumstance, hath these foure inconveniences attending it.

1 It supposeth that Divine justice in the execution of the legal curse admits of a satisfaction, contrary to *Psal. 49. 7, 8, 9. Job 36, 18, 19.*

2 That Eternity of Hell-torments is not absolute without some Ifs or Ands, but onely conditional, in case the damned cannot give satisfaction sooner.

3 To say that Eternity is not an essential part of Hell, is to say that Hell may be Hell, and yet not be Eternal.

4 If this part of the curse, *viz.* Eternity, may be taken away from Hell-torments, then Mr. *Norton* may as well take away any other part from it.

It

It is safest therefore (as I conceive) to say and hold, that eternity of punishment, flowing from the Curse, is from the voluntary cause, or from the free constitution of Gods good pleasure, as the due reward of sin.

Mr. *Sam. Hieron* saith, That the extremity of Hell-torments are made known to us two wayes. See Hieron works p. 294.

1 By the Universality of them in every part.

2 In that they continue without intermission after they are once begun.

But Mr. *Norton* opposeth both these.

1 Hee dispenseth with the Universality of the extremity of them in every part; hee saith, That Christ suffered the torments of Hell in his body, but not in full extremity; and therefore hee saith, what he wanted in his body, hee made it up in his soul-torments, in page 121.

2 Hee dispenseth with the eternity of continuance, and grants an intermission contrary to the Scripture that telleth us, *That the worm dyeth not, and that the fire never goeth out.*

The Torments of Hell (saith *Austin de Spiritu & Anima lib.* 3. c. 56. as I find him cited in *Carlisle*) are perpetual, terrible Terrors; fear without faith; pain without remission; the Hangman strangling, the Hell-hounds scourging, the worm gnawing, the conscience accusing, and the fire consuming, or rather continuing without mercy, end, relaxation, or ease. See also at *Reply* 5.

These, and such like things propounded in the Dialogue, Mr. *Norton* answers not, but puffes them away with this breath, They are circumstantial, and not of the essence of Punishment.

SECT. 3.

The Essential Punishment of the Curse (saith he in page 7.) *is the total temporal privation of all the sense of the good of the promise, called by some, The pain of Losse.*

Reply 3. IN this point of the pain of Losse, Mr. *Norton* is like to lose himself, for hee delivers himself variously, and contrariously, as may bee seen by comparing his ex-

pression in this place, with his various expressions in other places.

In page 31. line 5. Hee calls it the privation of the present fruition of the good of the promise: Here the word *sense* is left out.

In page 68. Hee saith, That Christ had a taste of consolation at present in the Garden; But, saith he, his desertion was total in respect of Sense upon the Crosse.

In page 111. (he saith) That the pain of Losse is the not enjoying of ought of the good of the promises; and in page 112. he calls it The privation of the good of the promises. In both these places the word *sense* is left out.

Now seeing Mr. *Norton* delivers himself thus variously, it may justly stumble any judicious Reader how to understand him, whether hee bee to bee understood as leaving out the word *sense*, or taking it in; for that word left out or taken in, doth much alter the sense.

In page 118. Hee tells us in the Margin of *Separatio quo ad substantiam*, in respect of substance, & *quo ad sensum*, in respect of sense and feeling.

Dr. *Ames* in *Psal.* 22. saith, Wee are not to understand that the desertion (of Christ) was real, but only in respect of sense and feeling; and so most the privation of the good of the promise bee understood; either that Mr. *Norton* doth mean it is real, or in respect of sense and feeling only.

The former is a total privation; the latter is only partial.

The former is judgement without mercy. *Jam.* 2. 13.

The latter remembers mercy in judgement, though it may not be discerned at the present.

Now if Mr. *Nortons* meaning bee, that Christ suffered such a privation of the good of the promise as is real, namely as it is contra-distinguished from privation in sense and feeling; then the word *sense* might well have been left out, because it being put in, doth cast a mist before the eyes of the Reader.

But if he mean no more but such a privation of the good of the promise, as consists only in sense and feeling, and as it is distinguished from the said real privation, then it is very improperly called a real privation, and then the pain of losse doth con-

Mr. *Norton* affirms that Christ suffered the pains of losse in respect of the fruition of the good of the promise; but otherwhiles he saith it was in respect of the sense of the good of the promise by which wide differing expressions he leaves the Reader in the dark to grope out his meaning.

See Dr. *Ames* in Psal. 22. cited also in Sect. 4.

contain much more in it then this; for a godly man may meet with as much as this in his life time, as *Iohn* did, if wee suppose him to be godly.

This Essential punishment (saith hee in page 8.) *was that, and only that, which Christ suffered.*

Reply 4. I cannot but wonder at his various delivery of himself.

For in his 5 *Dif.* page 10. He saith, That Christ suffered the paine of Hell due to the Elect, who for their sins deserved to bee damned.

And in page 33. He makes it one branch of the death threatned in Gen. 2. 17. to bee separated from the sense of the good things of the promise, and calls it totall in Christ, and total in the Reprobates, and all this flowing from the same Curse. Gen 2. 17.

And in page 68. He calls it his total desertion in respect of sense upon the Crosse; and presently after he saith, The paine of losse, and the paine of sense, make up the full measure of the essential wrath of God; and they both met together in full measure upon him on the Crosse. Mark this, Hee doth in both these places hold, that Christ suffered the full measure of the paine of losse.

And in page 79. He saith, That forsaking is either total and final; so God forsakes the Reprobate: or partial and temporal, as concerning the fruition and sense of the good of the promise; so God forsook Christ. Of this forsaking, Christ complains in this place, being a principal part of that punishment which Christ (as the Surety of the Elect) was to undergo. Psal. 22. 1. Mat. 27. 46.

And presently after he saith, That Christ suffered the guilt and punishment of sin; a chief part whereof was this Divine penal desertion; and his following words do imply, that this was the curse of the pain of Losse.

Mark that in this place hee holds only a partial forsaking.

And in page 80. He saith, That Christ was forsaken penally, yet partially and temporally, not totally and finally. Here also hee doth hold no more but a partial forsaking, and denies total.

And in page 118. Hee saith, Though the separation of the damned from God, is total and final; yet the separation or rather desertion of Christ was partial and temporal, in respect of the sense of the favour of God, and only for a time.

And saith he, There are two kinds of penal desertion, or forsaking; one is only in part for a time.

The other is total and final; so the Reprobates are forsaken in Hell.

And in page 122. Hee saith, That Christ was wholly forsaken in respect of any participation of the sense of the good of the promise for a time, *Matth.* 27. 46.

Matth. 27. 46.

But in page 123. Hee saith, That God forsook him with a temporal and partial desertion, and presently after, The soul and body, being separated from all participation of the good of the promise.

Here the word *sense* is left out, and in the former place hee denieth that he had any sense of the good of the promise.

Now let the Reader judge, whether hee can easily gather out of these various and uncertain expressions, what *Mr. Norton* doth distinctly affirm touching the pain of Losse, that Christ suffered; for one while, he calls it, Total separation; another while he saith, It was partial; and then the fruition and sense is put in also; one while hee doth limit his sufferings to the sense of the favour of God as in page 118, another while hee saith that hee was separated from all participation of the good of the promise, in page 123. In this last speech hee leaves out the word *sense*, which implies the highest degree of suffering; for it takes away the support of Gods Spirit to bear the pain of losse, which God doth often give, when the sense of his favour is wanting, and it also takes away other communications of his love.

Mr. Norton in p. 123 holds that Christ both in soul & body was separated from all participation of the good of the promise for a time, and so he comes up to Christs total separation from God for a time.

In this 123. page *Mr. Norton* doth speak out his meaning plain enough.

Namely that the soul and body of Christ was separated from all participation of the good of the promise for the while; and so he comes up to a Total (though temporary) separation from God, and more then a partial, which hee frequently denied in the places above cited, and comes up to a real separation,

tion, which Dr. *Ames* (above cited) doth deny; and to *separatio quo ad substantiam* mentioned in page 118. (and not only *quo ad sensum*) which Dr. *Willet* denies (as he there cites him) and the plain words of the Scripture do also oppose him in *Joh.* 16.32. *I am not alone, the Father is with me.* Now if the Father was present with him, then he had communion with his Father all the while that his Disciples did leave him alone; for that place doth tell us, that these words of Christ do refer to the whole time of his sufferings while his Disciples should leave him alone; hee told his Disciples that when the Shepherd was smitten, they should bee scattered, *Matth.* 26.31. *Yea said Christ,* Joh. 16.32. *The hour is now come that yee shall bee scattered, and yee shall leave me alone, and yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me,* in respect of inward support. Joh. 16.32.

2 On the other hand, if Mr. *Nortons* expressions do own that Christ suffered no more in the point of the pain of losse, save only the sense of the favour of God, and but only for a time as his expressions are in page 118. Then hee holds that Christ suffered no more in the point of the pain of losse, than many a child of God doth suffer in the work of their conversion, who do notwithstanding at the very same time partake of the good things of the promise, as Regeneration, Reconciliation, Justification, and Adoption: And then also, if Mr. *Norton* hold that Christ in his desertion suffered no more than this, he doth crosse himself with his other Principle in p. 123. That the execution of the evil of the Curse denies communion (but not union) with God; but it is out of all controversie that Christ had communion with God in other things, although Mr. *Nortons* supposition were true, that hee was deprived of the sense of his favour. Sometimes Mr. *Norton* makes the pain of losse to be no more but the want of the sense of the favour of God for a time.

The Judicious Reader will soon perceive that the pain of losse in the essentials of it, must needs produce greater sufferings then only the losse of the sense of Gods favour for a time, and Mr. *Norton* himself doth acknowledge as much in page 113. The pain of losse (saith he) consists not in the meer want of the favour or love of God; The Reprobates, whether men or devils, are alwayes hated of God, &c. And secondly, saith Dr. *Ames*, *Privation is the losse of an infinite good.* And thirdly, These Scriptures rightly expounded, will put more

In his Marrow c. 16. Thes. 2.

misery on the pain of losse (taken essentially) then onely the want of the sense of the favour of God for a time. *Matth.* 7. 23. *Matth.* 25. 41. 2 *Thess.* 1. 9.

Mr. *Norton* cannot maintain his penal hell in this life, without Gods extraordinary dispensation.

3 I will here produce one passage more from Mr. *Norton*, in page 120. *The dispensation of God* (saith he) *is either extraordinary or ordinary; According to the ordinary dispensation of God* (saith he) *the pains of Hell cannot be suffered in this life; but according to the extraordinary dispensation of God, Christ not only could, but did suffer the paine of Hell in this life.*

Reply 5. Ere while he said that the pain of losse was onely the losse of the sense of the favour of God for a time; if his sufferings were no more then so, then it is evident, that God, in the course of his ordinary dispensation, doth suffer many of his children in this life to bee wholly bereft of the sense of his favour for a time: Therefore in this case, what need is there that Mr. *Norton* should flye to Gods extraordinary dispensation, except hee think that the pain of sense, over and above the pain of losse, could not bee suffered without an extraordinary dispensation?

According to Gods ordinary dispensation, hee grants that Christ could not suffer Hell-torments in this life: But (saith he) he suffered them by an extraordinary dispensation, and yet according to Gods ordinary dispensation the Saints have suffered the pains of *Sheol*.

Now let the Reader judge what a refuge hee is forced to flye unto to support his grand Maxim; and how far he yeelds the case unto the Dialogue, seeing hee cannot maintain what hee would maintain, but by Gods extraordinary dispensation.

It is a poor peece of Divinity to maintain that for the only truth, and to condemn the contrary for damnable Heresie, and yet have no better proof to flye unto for the support of it, than Gods extraordinary dispensation.

Out of all doubt Purgatory, and the Miracles that are in the legend of Saints may passe for current truth, if they may but flye to Gods extraordinary dispensation, without demonstration of Scripture.

SECT.

SECT. 4.

Mr. *Norton* goes on to explain his first distinction in page 8. in these words.

The Accidental part of the punishment of the Curse is all the rest of the penall evill thereof, and befals the Reprobate, not from that Curse simply, but from the disposition of the Patient under that Curse. Of these accidental parts of punishment (which if you please may well passe under the name of penal adjuncts) are final and total separation from God, total and final despair, final death in sin, duration of punishment for ever, the place of punishment, &c.

Reply 1 THe Reader may please to take notice that (except Mr. *Norton* intend more under this unlimited word &c.) here is instanced only such penal evills as are competible to a sinner under damnation executed; But the precedent parts of punishment that flow upon sinners from the curse in this life the doth not mention, and whether he hold any of them to be essential parts of the curse, or no, he hath not expressed his meaning; but in his vindication of *Gen.* 2. 17. he placeth death in sin as well as death for sin within the compasse of the term Death, equally flowing from the curse there mentioned; some particulars of that death in sin may here then instanced; 1. The losse of Gods Image. 2 Corruption of nature. 3 Servitude under sin, and Satan. 4. Gods punishing one sin with another; These and the like are reckoned up by Dr. *Ames*, and he doth shew four wayes how they have the respect of punishment. Death in sin the essential Curse in Gen. 2. 17. In mat. l. 1. c. 12. Thes. 45, 46, 47.

Now if Christ bare all the essentials of the Curse, then hee must bear this of death in sin, as I have more at large opened the true sense of *Gen.* 2. 17. in *Chap.* 2. *Sect.* 3.

But fear of manifest blasphemy will deny that Christ bare this essential punishment of the Curse, and thence it will also follow, that either Christ bare not all the essentials, or that death in sin is not essential, though it flow essentially from the said Curse.

2 If Mr. *Norton* hold that the punishment of death in sin which doth befall all mankind in this life, is not (*de jure*, by due

due desert as it is a rule of relative justice) of its own nature an essential punishment flowing naturally and essentially from the said curse, but rather by accident; then let him shew how the said death in sin doth not proceed from that curse simply, but only from the condition of the Patient under the curse; but I believe it will trouble his patience to make a clear Answer to this.

In his first Argument, in page 10. Hee saith, this sentence (*In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt dye the death*) was universal, given to *Adam* as a publick person, and holds all his posterity, whether Elect or Reprobate, in case of sin, guilty of death; by death I suppose he means death in the latitude of it, according to his exposition of *Gen.*2.17. and there namely in page 20. he saith, that the death there spoken of is the wages of sin, *Rom.*5.21. and *Rom.*6.23. That is, all evill (the evill of *Adams* sin excepted) in one word; therefore (saith he) equivalent to an universal comprehending all kinds of death. Gen. 2. 17.

Reply 2. From hence the Reader may take notice of these two expressions. 1 That he makes that word Death, to comprehend all kind of death. 2 That the death there spoken of, is the wages of sin.

To me this is a peece of strange Divinity, that Mr. *Norton* should hold the wages of sin to bee either essential (namely such as flows from sin as the proper wages thereof) or else such as is accidental, namely such as is not the proper wages and desert of sin, but as it proceeds from the condition or disposition of the Patient under the said wages, and due desert of sin.

SECT.

SECT 5.

Mr. *Norton* still proceeds to explain his first Distinction, in *page* 8. in these words.

Absolute separation, dis-union, or dis-covenanting with God, is a consequent of Reprobation, not of the essence of Punishment, because the Elect, notwithstanding the commination stood in full force against them, yet they continued elected, and in Covenant with Christ; The Elect were in Christ, before they were in Adam.

Reply 1. I Suppose Mr. *Nortons* meaning is, That the Elect were in Christ virtually before they were in *Adam* actually. Hence I infer, that in the same sense they were elected in Christ, they were elected to be partakers of Christ, and his Ransome; if so, then I cannot see how the commination could stand in full force against them, seeing (according to that Election) they were by him redeemed from the curse of the Law, *Gal.*3.13. Enmity slain, *Eph.*2.16. no condemnation to them, *Rom.*8.1. and the hand-writing that was against them taken away, *Col.*2.14.

Seeing the Elect were in Christ virtually, before they were in *Adam* actually it proves that eternal death did not stand in full force against them, but a spiritual death only.

2 I confesse I am at a losse to find out the force of Mr. *Nortons* reason here given; But it may be it will the better appear, when it is drawn into the form of an Argument. And thus it may run.

If the Elect were in Christ before they were in *Adam*, and continued elected in Christ though the commination stood in full force against them: Then absolute separation, dis-union, and dis-covenanting with God, is a consequent of Reprobation, not of the essence of Punishment.

But the Elect were in Christ before they were in *Adam*, and continued elected in Christ, though the commination stood in full force against them.

Therefore absolute separation, dis-union, and dis-covenanting with God, is a consequent of Reprobation, But not of the essence of Punishment.

Suppose the Antecedent part of the first Propositon were granted (though it cannot bee all granted) yet I cannot see

strength enough in it to make good the consequence.

It is no good way of reasoning to argue, what is essential, or not essential in the Curse, from the event, namely from what *de facto* was executed, or not executed on the Elect, seeing betwixt them, and the Curse, the Covenant of grace doth (and from eternity did) virtually interpose, by Christ and his Ransome.

It is more proper to judge what *de jure* doth essentially flow from the curse to such as (being the proper subjects of the Curse) remain under it, without any interposition of Christ, and his Ransome by the Covenant of Grace.

3 I propound this to consideration, from a passage of Mr. *Nortons* in page 117. *Gods rejection* (saith he) *as it is the Antecedent, not the cause of sin; so it is also the Antecedent, and not the cause of condemnation: Reprobation* (saith he) *is an act of absolute Lordship and Sovereignty, not of Justice; Condemnation* (that is, *the judicial sentencing to punishment for sin*) *is an act of Justice, not of Lordship; no Reprobate suffers the smart of his finger, because a Reprobate, but because a sinner.*

Here I might by way of Parenthesis infer this Query; Was *Adam* rejected? and was that the Antecedent to *Adams* sin? And were not all mankind once in Covenant with God in *Adams* innocency?

4. I say, that absolute separation, dis-union, or dis-covenanting with God, is a part of that condemnation and judicial sentencing unto punishment for sin, *Matth.* 22. 13. *Matth.* 25. 41. *Matth.* 7. 23. 2 *Thes.* 1. 9. See further also in Dr. *Ames* his Marrow of Divinity, *l.* 1. *c.* 16. *n.* 7.

5 If total and absolute separation and dis-union with God, &c. be a consequent only of Reprobation, then it proceeds only from Gods Lordship and Sovereignty (as Mr. *Nortons* words speak) but in *Rev.* 20. 12. it proceeds from Justice. The dead were judged according to their works, not according to Gods Lordship, not Reprobation. And saith Dr. *Ames*, The hatred of Reprobation doth not inflict evill, but the defect of the creature coming betwixt. In his Marrow *l.* 1. *c.* 25. *n.* 38.

6 The same thing may be both a consequent of Reprobation, and a proper effect of justice, as Mr. *Norton* himself also acknowledgeth in page 111. *The legal dis-covenanting* (saith he) *of the Re-*

probate for their sin which they have committed, is the effect of justice; that being dis-covenanted they fall into the bottomlesse pit, is also an effect of justice, but totality and finality of their dis-union with God without recovery by the Covenant of Grace, is a consequent of Reprobation.

And why may it not bee as truly said, That the legal discovenanting of the Reprobater, and their falling into the bottomlesse pit, are consequents of reprobation, as say, that totality and finality of dis-union with God is a consequent of reprobation? they are alike consequents of reprobation, not proper effects of it, but rather effects of sin intervening, and consequently proper effects of Vindicative justice.

SECT. 6.

But Mr. *Norton* doth still explain his first Distinction, in these words, in page 8.

Sin is not of the Essence of Punishment, because Essential punishment is a satisfaction unto Justice for injury done; but sin is a continuing of the injury, and a provocation of, not a satisfaction unto justice.

2 Saith he, *Essential punishment is an effect of justice, of which God is the Author; But it is blasphemy to say that God is the Author of sin.*

3 Saith he, *The Elect suffer no part of penal punishment, yea are left unto sin (for a time)* This in the Parenthesis was in his Manuscript.

4 Saith he, in page 118. *The sinful qualities of the damned proceed not from Hell-torments as an effect from the cause. The torments of Hell are an effect and execution of justice, whereof God is the Author; Sinful qualities are a defect, not an effect, therefore they have a deficient, not an efficient cause, therefore of them God cannot be the Author.*

5 Saith he in page 118. *Christ suffered the Essential punishment, but was without sin.*

These five Reasons Mr. *Norton* hath given to prove that sin in fallen man, and sinful qualities, are not Essential, but Accidental to the Curse.

His first Reason examined.

MR. *Norton* saith, *That sin is not of the Essence of punishment, because sin is not a satisfaction to justice (but rather a provocation of it) for injury done.*

Reply 1. But saith Dr. *Ames*, Punishment is an evil inflicted on the sinner for sin, In his Marrow *l.*1.*c.*12.*n.*10,11. This is a more proper definition of punishment than Mr. *Nortons*.

Death in sin is an evil inflicted by God as the essential punishment of *Adams* sin, and was a satisfaction to justice, till it pleased God to make an alteration by the Covenant of Grace.

Original sin, as it was from Gods justice, was an evill inflicted of God on mans nature in general, as a satisfaction to justice, and so it was a vindicative punishment, till Christ was revealed; to difference the Elect from the Reprobate by the Covenant of Grace, *Sect.* 1. *Sect.* 3.

2 Besides the punishment of original sin, God doth often punish mens personal sins with sin, which in some sort may also be said to bee a satisfaction unto justice; But as that sin doth proceed from mans disobedience to Gods Command, so it is a new and further provocation.

His second Reason examined.

Mr. *Norton* saith, *That Essential punishment, is an effect of justice, of which God is the Author*; But saith he, *It is blasphemy to say that God is the Author of sin.*

Reply 2. It is granted that sin, as it is sin, namely as it is a transgression of Gods Law, is not from God as the Author of it; But yet when man doth act voluntarily without any compulsion from God (and to hold otherwise were blasphemy) that sin as it is vindicative from God, is a fruit and curse of former sin, carrying with it the respect of punishment; so taken it is neither blasphemy, nor unsound Divinity, to say that God is the Author of it; And thus original sin was from Gods justice inflicted on all mankind for *Adams* Covenant-sin. And Mr. *Norton* himself saith thus in page 118. in that Proposition, *God punisheth sin with sin; the futurition of sin is to be distinguished from sin it self: The infallible and penal futurition of sin is an effect of justice.*

The

The Reader will see cause to take his meaning to be an Essential effect of justice; and for this see also Dr. *Ames* in his Marrow *l.*1 *c.*12.*n.*45,46,47. And sundry others of the Learned do say, That God is not permissive, but active also, as a just Judge, in some sins of men, from these and the like Scriptures, 2 *Sam.*16.10.2 *King.*22.22,23. *Rom.*1.26. *Ezek.*14.9.

His third Reason examined.

Mr. *Norton* saith, *That the Elect, though they suffer no part of penal justice, yet they are left unto sin for a time.*

Reply 3. I have said oft that original sin was penal justice in *Adam*, till it please God to make an alteration by revealing the Covenant of Grace.

The punishments that the Elect suffer, are *de jure* penal justice, but in the issue *de facto* are not.

And so also the punishments that the Elect do suffer since the Covenant of Grace was revealed, are, *de jure* penal justice, though in the issue *de facto* they are not. To be under the power of sin, though but in part, and so likewise to be under temptations, afflictions, bodily death, &c. are the due wages of sin, effects of the Curse flowing from it, as such in themselves, and by their own nature, though God is pleased by the Covenant of Grace to alter the nature of them to the Elect; and Mr. *Nortons* own words do testifie that the Elect do suffer that *de jure*, which is penal justice; for in Page 10. Argument 1. he saith thus, *This sentence*, namely Gen.2.17. *was universal, given to* Adam, *as a publick person, and holds all his posterity, whether Elect or Reprobate, in case of sin, guilty of death.* Gen.2.17.

His fourth Reason examined.

Mr. *Norton* saith, *That sinful qualities are a defect not an effect, they have a deficient, not an efficient cause, and therefore of them God cannot be the Author.*

Reply 4. I may say, the same of natural death, it is a defect; therfore it hath a deficient, and not an efficient cause, and darkness also is a defect, therefore it hath a deficient, and not an efficient cause. Now let Mr. *Norton* shew how either of these have God for their Author, and when that is done, he may see the weak-

neſſe of his reaſon; If he be unwilling to anſwer, then Dr. *Ames* doth anſwer the former in theſe words; Death is not from God as he did ordain nature, but it is from God as taking vengeance on ſin; And Dr. *Willet* doth anſwer the latter; hee firſt makes this Objection, If Death be the puniſhment of ſin, then God ſhould be the Author of death, becauſe he is the Author of puniſhment: He anſwers thus, As God created light, darkneſſe he created not, but diſpoſed of it; ſo he made not death, but (as it is a puniſhment) God as a diſpoſer rather, and a juſt judge, than an Author, inflicted it. And *Bar. Traberon* anſwereth his Objecter thus; Will you ſay, That death came into the world by the envy of the Devil, *ergo*, it was not ordained of God? Did God, as *Iſaiah* teacheth (Chap. 30. 33.) ordain *Gehenna* from yeſterday (that is to ſay, from eternity) and not death? and ſo ſaith he, Sin came not into the world beſides Gods Ordinance. And to this purpoſe ſpeaks *Peter Martyr* of the Privation of Gods Image in *Adam*, and of Original ſin, as I have cited him in Chap. 2. Sect. 3 *ult.* So then ſin, as it is a puniſhment, hath an efficient, as well as a deficient cauſe.

Death is not from God as he did ordain nature, but it is from Gods juſtice as a puniſhment for original ſin. The like may be ſaid of eternal death, it is from Gods juſtice, as a puniſhment of original ſin to ſuch as do not repent and beleeve in the promiſed ſeed. See Dr. *Ames Mar. l.* 1 c. 12. n. 31. Dr. *Willet* in Ro. 5. Q. 22. in Anſ. to Obj. 2. *Bar. Traberon* on Rev. 4. *P. Mar.* in Compl. *part* 1. *p.* 190.

His fifth Reaſon examined.

Mr. *Norton* ſaith, *That Chriſt ſuffered the Eſſential puniſhment, and yet was without ſin.*

Reply 5. Chriſts ſufferings do all ariſe from the voluntary cauſe, and not from natural cauſes as ours do, namely from a voluntary poſitive Law, and not from the moral Law. But whether Chriſt ſuffered the eſſential puniſhment or no, is the great buſineſſe of this diſpute. The Dialogue denies it all along; let the judicious Reader judge whether this be fair diſputing to bring in ſuch a Propoſition as is in controverſie (and which hee knows before-hand will be denied) as a reaſon to confirm another doubtful point, this is no better than a begging of the Queſtion.

And now I leave it to the judicious Reader to judge whether his five Reaſons have weight ſufficient in them, to prove, that ſin as it is vindicative from God, flows not from the curſe Eſſentially; and his own words on *Gen.* 2. 17. which I have cited in my former

former *Reply* to his third Reason, do affirm as much, and his words also in page 37. *Judicial punishment* (saith he) *of sin with sin*; but in his Manuscript copy, it is, *penal punishment of sin with sin, is an act of vindicative justice.* The Reader may understand him to mean it of the essential part of justice.

6 I will examine that passage in page 118.

The sinful qualities of the damned (saith he) *proceed not from Heb-torments as an Effect from the Cause.*

Reply 6. It is worth examination what he means by the sinful qualities of the damned, whether such as they carry with them to Hell, or the multiplication of sin when they come there, flowing from that sinful habit which they brought with them thither.

The former may properly be called sinful qualities, the latter, sinful acts proceeding from that sinful habit of original sin; And of these latter Dr. *Ames* doth tell us, That they have more respect of punishment, than sin. In like sort the Summe of Divinity set forth by *John Downame*, page 254. makes hatred against God (in the damned) and final desperation, to be a great part of their punishment, as the Dialogue doth. See also *Peter Martyrs* Answer to *Piggius*, in Chap. 2. *prope finem.* In his *Med.* l. 1. c. 16. a. 10, 11.

SECT. 7.

Still Mr. *Norton* explains his first Distinction in these words.

Duration for ever, and the place of punishment, are adjuncts, as the nature of them sufficiently shews.

Reply IT is beyond my capacity, I confesse, to judge whether the eternal estate both of Elect and Reprobate after this life, do come within the compasse of a Physical adjunct of time; all things are called Eternal that were before the Creation of the world, because there is no setting of them out by any measure of time; and why should wee think of any Physical adjunct of time after this world is ended? shall there be Physical

sical bodies, and time then, as there is now? I wish the Learned to resolve this point; Eternity (saith *Rutherford*, In Christ dying) is not such a particular duration, as time is, that hath a poor point to begin with, and end at.

Mr. *Norton* makes this point of duration to bee an adjunct only to Hell-torments, by a comparison taken from the inability of the debtor to pay, and therefore hee continues in prison. But to this I have already answered in the second Section of this Chapter.

SECT. 8.

Giving some Reasons why Mr. Nortons *Judgement cannot be sound in this Point of Christs suffering of the essential curse.*

Reason 1.

BEcause he doth often confute and contradict his foundation-Principles.

For 1. whereas the Dialogue doth propound this Quere, *Did Christ suffer the torments of hell in his Body as well as in his Soul, to redeem our Bodies as well as our Souls from hell torments?*

His Answer in pag. 120. is this; *It is evident, that as Christ suffered the torments of hell in kind in his Soul; so who can deny but he suffered also bodily torments, equivalent to the torments of Hell, though not inflicted after the same manner.*

Reply 1. Any man may see that in this Answer he doth plainly contradict and confute his first principal Proposition, and also his Assertion in his first Distinction; for in this and in other places also, he doth affirm, That Christ suffered the essential punishment of the curse, and in pag. 123. he saith, *That Christ both in Soul and Body was separated from all participation of the good of the promise for a time*; but in his Answer he dares not venture to say, that he suffered the torments of hell in his body in kind, as he did in his soul; But instead of making a clear Answer to my Quere, he propounds another Quere, *Who can deny*, saith he, *but that he suffered also bodily torments equivalent to the torments of hell?* His first ground-work was, that Christ suffered in a way of exact justice

stice the essential punishment of the curse of the Law, and now he flies to the word Equivalent; all that know any thing of the strict justice of the Law, do know that it will not alter one jot from the punishment threatned in kind, to that which is equivalent; if Mr. *Norton* (being now put to a pinch) to answer this Quere, will allow of so much alteration from the letter of the Law to equivalency, then he doth also affirm, that the Law was relaxed to make a new Covenant for equivolency, and yet in pag. 146. and in pag. 174 he denies acceptilation, and thus he crosseth himself up and down, and stands not fast to his first ground-work.

2 He crosseth his first ground-work in page 121. *It is sufficient,* saith he, *to integrate, and make up the execution of the full measure of wrath upon Christ, that if his bodily torments were not equal to the bodily torments of the damned, yet what was not executed on his body, was made up in his soul.*

Reply 2. He that hath but half an eye may see that in this Answer, he doth fully overthrow his first fundamental Proposition, and his first Distinction, for in those places he hath affirmed that Christ suffered the very Essential Torments of Hell, in kind; but now he saith it is sufficient to integrate, and make up the full execution of the full measure of wrath, that what was not executed on his body, was made up in his soul; first, hee confesseth that Christ did not suffer the full essential Curse in his body, and then by some Revelation he knows that what was not executed on his body was made up in his soul; beleeve him that list, and yet he crosseth this also in page 123; for there hee saith, That Christ both in soul and body, was separated from all participation of the good of the promise for a time; And thus he makes the eternal Curse in *Gen.* 2. 17. one while to be executed in kind only, and another while to be arbitrary, and to bee suffered either in kind, or else in that which is equivalent; hee allows a lesse punishment to his body, and so much more to his soul; doubtless he must know this by some private Revelation, for he cannot find any Scripture that is rightly interpreted that will own it.

L But

But yet Mr. *Norton* doth labour to prove it thus: *The measure of Hell-paines* (saith he) *is made up without bodily paines in the Angels that fell.*

Reply 3. What a deceitful kind of reasoning is this, for all men know that the fallen Angels have no bodies, and therefore they must needs suffer the full measure of Hell-torments, without bodily Torments.

And in page 122. (he saith according to his fundamental Proposition) *That Christ was tormented without any forgivenesse, God spared him nothing of the due debt.*

Reply 4. But Mr. *Norton* doth plainly crosse this Assertion also; for hee said formerly, that what was not executed on his body, was made up in his soul; here he acknowledgeth that Christ had some forgivenesse, in respect of his bodily Torments.

And in page 122. Hee saith, *That Christ had not so much as the least drop of water to ease him in the least particle of his suffering that was due to him according to justice, but was wholly forsaken in respect of any participation of the sense of the good of the promise for a time.*

Reply 5. This he doth also plainly crosse, for in page 68. hee doth acknowledge that Christ had a taste of consolation in the time of his Agony in the Garden, so that hee doth sometimes give Christ a taste of consolation under his Essential Torments, and sometimes not a drop of consolation; either he must confesse that Christ was not yet under the essential punishment of the Curse in the Garden, or else he must confesse that his Position in page 122. is not true; But he doth affirm, That Christ suffered the essential Curse in the Garden, in page 70. in these words, Hee had clods, rather then drops, streaming down his blessed body, a thing which neither was heard nor seen, before, nor since. And saith he, The true reason thereof is, Christ dyed as a sinner imputatively, pressed under the sense of the wrath of God, and conflicting with eternal death. And in page 122. Christ suffered the Torments of Hell upon the Crosse, where he bare the moral Curse, *Gal.* 3.13. and in the Garden.

Hence

Hence it follows, that by these two last places he doth retract his former Position in page 122. but still that is contradictory which I cited in page 68. And thus Mr. *Norton* doth confute and contradict himself; and being uncertain in his principles, he leaves the truth of Christs satisfaction uncertain to a scrutinous conscience.

Mr. *Samuel Hetton* saith in page 244. That the extremity of Hell-torments is made known to us two wayes.

1 By the universality of them, in every part.

2 In that they continue without intermission, after they are once begun.

1 Mr. *Norton* doth cross both these Positions; For first, hee allows some ease to the body of Christ, though he saith, It was made up in his soul. And secondly, Hee had also some drop of consolation to his soul in the Garden.

2 Hee also grants an intermission after Hell-torments were begun upon Christ; for in page 68. Christ, saith he, had his interims of respite, and in the Garden an interval of consolation, otherwise, saith hee, Hee could not have fulfilled that which is written of him. But if this reason bee sound and good, why hee had an interval of consolation in the Garden, then by the same reason he must have an interval of consolation on the Crosse; for when he was in his greatest Torments on the Crosse, and ready to give up his soul, then he remembred that something must be fulfilled that was written of him, for so doth *John* tell us, *Joh.19.28. Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished, and that the Scripture might be fulfilled*, (said, *I thirst*; Wherefore did he say, *I thirst?* the answer is, because he remembred that that Scripture in *Ps.69.21.* must be fulfilled, and therefore he said, *I thirst. When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar* (for the fulfilling of that Prophesie) *he said, It is finished, and hee bowed his head, and gave up the ghost*: Therefore no extremity of Torments did confound his memory and will, from fulfilling of what ever was written; but though Mr. *Norton* doth allow some interims of respite to Christ in the Garden, yet other whiles he saith, That Christ (whiles he was in the Garden) began not meerly to be amazed, but also to bee very heavy. The word (saith he) notes Expavefaction, which was such a motion of his mind, superadded to his consternation, whereby for the time hee was dis-inabled as concerning the

Joh.19.28.

Joh.19.30.

minding of any thing else, being wholly taken up with the dreadful sense of the righteous wrath of God; he must have a better head then I, that can reconcile his former speech, and this latter speech together; before he said, that Christ had his interims of respite in the Garden, and an interval of consolation, or else he could not have minded the fulfilling of that which was written of him; but now he saith, that in the Garden, he was in such a motion in his mind, whereby for the time he was dis-inabled as concerning the minding of any thing else; It is strange that hee should not be able to mind any thing else; and yet in his greatest torments on the Crosse, wee see, he was able to mind that one Scripture to be fulfilled, therefore hee said, *I thirst*: Therefore I conclude that this interpretation of Christs fear and heavinesse in the Garden, by amazement, and by such a motion of his mind as dis-inabled him from the minding of any thing else but the sense of the dreadful wrath of God, is a most dangerous imputation of sin to Christ in the time of the execution of his Priestly Office, as I have noted it in Mar. 14 33. in Chap. 17. Sect. 4. And though Dr. *Williams* doth hold that Christ suffered both the pain of Losse, and the pain of Sence, in page 437. yet in page 447. hee saith, That all the Divine comforts were not detained from him on the Crosse, when he said, *My God, My God, Why hast thou forsaken me.*

Mr. *Norton* imputes the sin of unmindfulnesse to Christ in time of executing his office.

In his seven golden Candlesticks, p. 437. & 447.

Hence it follows that Mr. *Nortons* judgement cannot be sound, because he doth so often contradict himself, and that Scripture of *Job.* 19, 28.

Reason 2.

My second Reason why Christ did not suffer the Essential Torments of Hell.

Payment in kind doth justifie the Elect actually as soon as they have life in the womb.

If Christ made satisfaction by suffering the Essential punishment of the Curse in our stead: Then it doth necessarily follow, that all the Elect are actually justified as soon as ever they have life in the womb, and therefore before they can have any actual faith: (This opinion of Mr. *Nortons* doth strongly support the Antinomian Tenent.)

In his Sermon of justification by faith, p. 22.

But saith Mr. *Woodbridge*, It is evident by Scripture, That none are actually justified till they have faith; and the ground of this

It

is (saith he) because the death of Christ was not *solutio ejusdem* but *tantidem*, not the payment of that which was in the obligation but the equivalent, being not the payment of the Debtor, but of the Surety, and therefore it doth not deliver *ipso facto*, but according to the compact and agreement between the Father and him, when he undertook to be our Surety. If a Debtor (saith he) bring me what he owes me, it dischargeth him presently: But the payment of a Surety is a payment that is refusable in it self, and therefore it effects not the discharge of the principal Debtor, but at the time, and according to the conditions between the Surety and the Creditor, and that time agreed on, was not till those that live to years of discretion have actual faith.

My third Reason why Christ did not suffer the Essential Punishment of the Curse. Reason 3.

If Christ made satisfaction by paying our proper Debt, in kind, then there is no place left for pardon; But it is evident that God doth daily pardon believing sinners of his meer grace and mercy, yea according to the greatnesse of his mercy, as the Dialogue shews, page 31. 154, 156, &c. And the ground of this is because the death of Christ, was not *solutio ejusdem*, but *tantidem*. Payment in kind leaves no room for the exercising of Gods free pardon.

1 If In, and with Christ (saith Mr. *Wotton*) we have formerly satisfied the justice of God, then there is no place left for pardon; for the same man, for the same offence cannot bee both punished and pardoned by God, because pardon and punishment are directly contrary. *De Reconc. peccatoris part. 2. l. 1. c. 21. Sect. 8.*

2 Saith Mr. *Baxter*; If the proper Debt either of obedience or suffering be paid, either by our selves, or by any other, then there is no place left for pardon, for when the Debt is paid, wee owe nothing (except obedience for ever) and therefore can have nothing forgiven us; for the Creditor cannot refuse the proper debt, nor deny an acquittance upon the receit thereof. In his *Aphor. of Just. p. 169.*

But Christ having paid the *Tantidem*, and not the *Idem*, the value, and not the strict debt: This satisfaction the Father might have chosen to accept, or to have discharged us upon Christs suffering, which yet because hee did freely accept, therefore his gracious act is properly called, Pardon.

3 Saith Mr. *Baxter* in page 143. By reason of the obligation upon us, we our selves were bound to undergo the punishment, therefore Christs punishment was not in the obligation, but only ours, and so the Law was not fully executed but relaxed; And whereas the satisfaction of Christ is called a gracious acceptation, a gracious imputation, &c. How can any man, saith *Baxter* call it thus; If it were the same thing that the Law required that Christ payed? to pay all according to the full exaction of the obligation, needeth no favour to procure acceptance.

4 The chief Argument of *Grotius* and *Vossius* (saith Mr. *Baxter* in Appendix 39.) is drawn from the Tenure of the obligation, and from the event. The obligation chargeth punishment upon the offender himself (only) *In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt dye.* Now if the same in the obligation is paid, then the Law is executed, and not relaxed; and then every sinner must dye himself, for that is the *idem*, and the very thing threatned; so that here, *Dum alius solvit, simul aliud solvitur*; The Law threatned not Christ, but us. Besides, Christ suffered not the losse of Gods love, nor his image and graces, nor eternity of Torment.

5 Every seventh yeer was a yeer of releasing Debts, *Deut.* 15.1. figuring the yeer of Gods grace by Christ, by whom we have obtained of God the release of our debts, that is, the forgivenesse of our sins, *Luke* 4.18. *Mat.* 6.12. *Mar.* 11.25. this figured, that we should be kind one to another, forgiving one another even as God for Christs sake hath forgiven us, *Eph.* 4.32. *Col.* 3.12,13. *Luke* 6.35,36. Now Releasements of a debt, and exact payment either by our selves, or by our Surety, cannot possibly stand with kindnesse and mercy: This overthroweth Popish satisfaction, and quencheth the fire of Purgatory, saith *Marbeck*, and say I, this doth overthrow Mr. *Norton*s Tenent that will allow no other satisfaction but the suffering of the Essential Curse, in kind, by our Surety; and so consequently, he leaves no room for Gods gracious releasment of our debts.

My fourth Reason is this.

Because it is exceeding derogatory to the infinite satisfaction

of

of Christs sacrifice to place full satisfaction in Christs suffer-[illegible] formality of his Death & Sacrifice, which was ordained to be the complearment of all satisfaction, and therefore full satisfaction cannot be the final end of suffering Hell-torments as *Mr. Norton* makes it to be. For in p. 32. he saith, *That Christ suffered the essential penal wrath of God, which* (saith he) *doth answer the suffering of the second Death, before he suffered his natural death.* Here the Reader may take notice that *Mr. Norton* makes the final end of Christs sufferings to bee for full satisfaction, and to bee accomplished before his death, and so consequently, hee makes Christs Death and Sacrifice to be altogether vain and needlesse as to the point of satisfaction; such a poysonful assertion as this, may soon poyson a great deal of Divine Scripture-truth. But of satisfaction by the Death and Sacrifice of Christ, I shall speak more hereafter, especially in Chap. 17.

To affirm full satisfaction by suffering Hell-torments before the complearment of Christs death, doth derogate from the sufficiency of his death and sacrifice.

My fifth Reason is in Chap. 5.

To affirm that Christ suffered the Essential Torments of Hell, is to affirm that Christ suffered from Gods hatred, for the Essential Torments of Hell is inflicted from Gods hatred. See Chap. 5.

Chap. 6. and almost every other Chapter, affords a distinct Argument against Hell-torments, which the Reader will easily observe; But I will propound this one at present for my sixth Reason.

My sixth Reason is in Chap. 12.

The true nature of all Christs greatest sufferings are called Chastisements in *Isa.* 53. 5. therefore they cannot bee the Essential Torments of Hell from Gods vindicative wrath.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

His second Distinction examined, which is this, in Page 9.

Distinguish between the wrath of God, and the hatred of God. Wrath is sometimes taken for Hatred; and then it signifies Reprobation, &c. Though God in the second sense, not in the first, may be said to be wroth with Christ, yet in no sense could God be said ever to hate Christ.

God hates both persons and sins of the Reprobates; he hates sin in the Surety, and in the Elect, but he ever loved their persons.

With this compare another speech of Mr. *Nostes* in page 113. *Then (saith he) the pain of Losse consists not in the meer want of the love or favour of God; for the Reprobates, Men, or Devils, are alwayes hated of God, Gods Love and Hatred are Eternal and Immutable.*

Reply 1. THough it bee granted that the Hatred of God signifies Reprobation, yet there is also a Hatred of God that reacheth unto Eternity.

The essential Torments of Hell is from Gods hatred, to affirm therefore that Christ suffered the essential Torments of Hell, is to affirm that Christ suffered from Gods hatred.

This cannot be Reprobation, for these two Reasons.

1 The hatred of Reprobation, saith Dr. *Ames*, in his *Marrow l.1.c.25.n.38.* doth only deny good, but doth not inflict evill, save only by the desert of the creature coming between.

This hatred of God doth inflict the evill of the curse upon the damned, Therefore it is a hatred that is distinct from that of Reprobation.

2 This hatred is Eternal; for though Reprobation bee from Eternity in God, yet it is not Eternal; and the reason is, because the end of Gods Reprobation is the manifestation of his justice, *Rom.9.22.* and when Gods justice is manifested, and the

the Curse executed, then the end is obtained, and so Reprobation ceaseth. See Dr. *Ames* in *Marrow* l. 1. c. 25. Thes. 32.

Reply 2. In propriety of speech, God is without all passions of anger, wrath, hatred, &c. these things are ascribed to God after the manner of men, when God doth that which doth make us think him to be angry, and to hate, because we do so when wee are angry, and when we do hate.

Hence it follows, that seeing Mr. *Norton* holds that God did execute the Essential punishment of Hell-torments upon Christ, as they are due to Reprobates, that God must do it in hatred to him, as well as to the Reprobates; and so the *Hebrew* Doctors in Chap. 15. expound the term Second death (from whom it is taken) to bee a perpetual misery in the hatred of God; And so saith Mr. *Rutherford* in Christs dying, page 35. 39. The Hell of the Reprobates is a satisfactory pain, and 2. It floweth from the hatred of God.

But saith Mr. *Norton*, *Though God did execute the Essentials upon Christ, yet in no sense could he be said ever to hate Christ.*

But how can it be avoided? perhaps Mr. *Norton* will say, because God did not execute the accidental and circumstantial parts of the Curse upon Christ.

But may it not be more truly said, because Christ did not deserve the Essentials? Let the unpartial Reader judge between us.

M CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Mr. *Nortons* third Distinction in Page 9. examined, which is this:

Distinguish concerning Imputation of sin.
Imputation of sin is either of the commission of sin, or of the guilt of sin: guilt taken not for the commission of sin, but for the obligation to punishments for sin committed, sin is imputed to Christ in the latter sense.

Reply 1. I Grant that Gods imputation of sin, is either of sin it self, or of guilt, or rather of both, for they are correlates, and therefore Gods imputation, whether it bee understood of sin it self, or of sin and guilt joyntly, it doth alwayes in Scripture-language refer to the same subject.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in Page 41. *Guilt and Punishments are Relates.*

Reply 2. I grant they are alwayes Relates, according to the order of legal proceedings in Courts of justice; and in this way and order of satisfaction doth Mr. *Norton* go all along.

All Christs sufferings were from the voluntary cause and covenant, and not from the legal Court-order of the guilt of our sins imputed.

But in point of Christs satisfaction, I go all along in the way and order of Voluntary causes, and according to the way and order of those causes the suffering of punishments is not a Relate to the imputation of sin preceding: As for example, in the point of tryal of Masteries, there the suffering of punishments is meerly and only from the voluntary Cause and Covenant, both in the Law-makers, and in the undertakers, and such were all the sufferings of Christ, they were all from the voluntary Cause and Covenant, and all his outward sufferings were from his voluntary undertaking (to enter the lists with Sathan, according to Gods declaration in *Gen.*3,15.) and not from the imputation of the guilt of our sins, according to the order of Court-justice.

Grant

I grant also, that when ever God doth punish any one in anger, it is alwayes from the imputation of sin in the subject; and so saith Mr. *Burges*, God afflicts none (namely in anger) but where there is sin in the subject, and in that sense guilt and punishment are Related; but yet from the Voluntary cause and Covenant, punishments may be suffered without judicial imputation, and so consequently without judicial anger. But of this, see more in my *Reply* to 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. See *Burges* on Justif. p. 27.

The guilt of *Adams* sin (saith Dr. *Reynolds*) is inseparable from the sin it self, being the proper passion of it. In his sinfulnesse of sin. p. 31.

Lo! in this short sentence, how he doth connex guilt and punishment inseparably to *Adams* first sin; he makes his guilt to be the proper passion of his first sin. And hence it follows necessarily, according to Mr. *Norton*, That the guilt of *Adams* sin being imputed to Christ, he must be spiritually dead in sin, for spiritual death in sin is the proper guilt, and proper passion of *Adams* first sin. This I hinted at in the Dialogue. And of this see more in Chap. 2. in R. 2. 21.

If original sin had not been ordained in Gods justice to bee the proper guilt and punishment of *Adams* first sin, then it would follow that *Adams* eating of the forbidden fruit had been no sin: And now compare Mr. *Nortons* distinction to the guilt of *Adams* sin, Imputation of guilt (saith he) is the obligation to punishment: By this Doctrine it follows, that Christ did suffer the guilt and punishment of *Adams* first sin, namely, a spiritual death in sin.

Truly it makes my heart tremble at this inference; God indeed imputes the guilt of *Adams* first sin to all the natural posterity of *Adam*, because Gods Covenant was made with *Adam*, and the nature of all mankind in general, as I have shewed in Chap. 2. And in this respect all men are true sinners in *Adam*; and therefore truly guilty of the punishment threatned, but so was not Christ, hee was not of *Adam* by ordinary Generation. God imputes the guilt of *Adams* first sin to all men, because all mankind were true sinners in *Adam* by vertue of Gods Covenant touching mans nature in general.

Our guilt (saith Mr. *Baxter* in his Preface to Mr. *Ayr*, page 7.) was *Reatus culpæ & pœnæ propter culpam ex obligatione legis*; Christs guilt is but *Reatus pœnæ propter culpam nostram ex voluntaria susceptione*, Christ was *Obligatus ad eandem* (the same in value) but not *Eadem obligatione*; And in his late Reply to *Molinæum*, page 324. he doth justly taxe this kind of Imputation to bee the very root

and master-vayn of all Antinomianism. And in page 225. saith hee, Bee it known to you therefore, that Christ did obey and suffer in the person of a Mediator, and not in *persona delinquentis*, though for the sins of the Delinquent (being obliged to suffer by his voluntary undertaking) and therefore his sufferings, or obedience, are none of ours, as performed by him.

But Mr. *Norton* in the point of imputing our sins to Christ, doth go beyond his said Distinction, as I apprehend.

For in page 79. *ult.* Hee saith, *That Christ was a notorious Malefactor, having upon him the guilt of the sins of the Elect by imputation, and that justly before God.*

In page 98. *Whom wee have already proved to be the greatest offender, as being imputatively guilty of all the sins of the Elect, both hanged upon the Crosse, and others.*

In page 103. *He was the greatest Malefactor imputatively, in Gods account.*

Reply 3. In these and other like places he makes our sins as well as our guilt to be imputed to Christ. But saith *Peter Martyr*, It cannot be shewed out of the Scripture, that any man is called a sinner, but either he hath sin in himself, or else undoubtedly hee hath before committed sin, unlesse wee will say that God maketh men guilty without any sin committed by them.

In Rom 5. p. 221. b.

P. Martyr, I confess, speaks this of Infants that dye before they have committed any actual sin; but yet it is a four square truth in general, Turn it on which side you will, and it will lye fast; he tells *Piggius*, that God could not impute the guilt of *Adams* sin to Infants, unlesse Infants had been first truly guilty of *Adams* sin; and it is evident that all Infants, and all the world are truly guilty of *Adams* sin, because all mankind were in *Adam*, not only naturally, but also legally in regard of the stipulation and covenant between God and him, as the head of mans nature in general; So that by the force of that Covenant concerning mans nature in general, all mankind had an interest in the good of the promise of that Covenant, in case of *Adams* obedience, and in the evil of the Curse of that Covenant, in case of his disobedience; and therefore seeing all had this equal interest in the Covenant of nature, it follows, that wee had an interest in his sin, as well as in his guilt, and therefore the guilt of his sin is justly

justly imputed to Infants as well as unto others; and this example doth shew us that sin and guilt are related in the same subject, and not in two distinct subjects, and this *David* did acknowledge in *Ps.*32.5. *I said I will confess my transgressions to the Lord, and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin*: Mark this, he doth acknowledge that God did not onely forgive his sin, but the iniquity, guilt, or punishment of his sin (namely, condemnation, but not all outward punishments) In these words I say it is evident, that *David* doth acknowledge that sin and guilt do cleave as close together, as the skin and flesh do to the bones, and the like he doth acknowledge in *Psal.*41.5. and therefore if the guilt of our sins was imputed to Christ, then out of doubt sin it self was imputed to Christ also, and so Mr. *Norton* doth dangerously affirm just as the *Antinomians* do.

Secondly touching the point of Gods imputation, I believe it cannot be shewed out of the Scripture, that God doth impute either guilt or any other thing to any person, unless the thing imputed have first a real existence in the subject; as for example, God did not impute faith to *Abraham* for righteousness, until faith had a real existence in him, as the subject, and the like must be said of any thing else that God imputes, therefore if God imputed the guilt of our sins to Christ, then it follows that he was indeed guilty of sin

So that by Mr. *Norton's* unadvised collections, either Christ was a true inherent sinner, or else the Father was a true sinner in making a false imputation; I wish that Mr. *Norton* may finde sound light from the Scriptures to get himself fairly out of this dilemma.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in pag.33.

To impute, in Court-language, is judicially to reckon unto a person, either that which is his properly, and not onely as a legal Surety; so sin is imputed to the offender, Lev.27.4. *Or that which is not his properly, but as a legal Surety onely*; so Philemon *may put* Onesimus *debt upon* Paul, *ver.*18. *Or by way of grace; so the word impute is used ten times in* Rom. 4.

Reply 4. To impute in Court-language! I wonder where that Court-language is used in Scripture about Gods proceeding

ding with Christ in point of satisfaction: Surely the blessed Scripturrs have no such language; and therfore surely he had need to get better proofs than any he hath hitherto produced, to prove that Christ was a Delinquent-surety in law, which I believe he will never be able to prove, or else his Court-proceedings in point of satisfaction will fail him; but I conceive I have sufficiently shewed in Chap. 2. that Christ was not in the same obligation with *Adam* in the first Covenant, and the matter is so plain, that he that runs may read it in the very letter of the Text; *In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt dye*; Thou as the head of mans nature in general, thou shalt die, as I have shewed in ch. 2. Sect. 3. Christ cannot be comprehended as *Adams* Surety in this word *Thou*, unless Mr. *Norton* will make him to be one of *Adams* natural posterity, according to the manner of other men; besides, the threatning to be suffered is plainly directed to the sinner himself in person; and therefore Christ was not in that obligation; and therefore also Mr. *Nortons* Court-language of imputation of guilt to Christ, as to our legal Surety, is no Scripture-language, it is but human language.

Christ was not *Adams* Surety to the first Covenant; none but *Adam* as he was the head of mans nature in general, was in the first Covenant. See also Reply 6. *Gen.* 2. 17. In his appendix to justif. p. 143

By reason of the obligation upon us (saith Mr. *Baxter*) we our selves were bound to undergo the punishment; therefore (saith he) Christs punishment was not in the obligation, but onely ours, and so the Law was not fully executed but relaxed; and whereas the satisfaction of Christ, saith he, is called a gracious acceptation, a gracious imputation, &c. How can any man (saith he) call it so, if it were the same thing that the Law required that Christ paid; to pay all according to the full exaction of the obligation, needeth no favour to procure acceptance.

This very acknowledgement that Christs satisfaction was accepted of grace, doth clearly intimate, that Christ was not in the same obligation with *Adam*, or else it had been no favour to accept it of him.

See *Blake* on the Covenant, p. 18.

The Father (saith Mr. *Blake*) might have refused his discharge from the hand of Christ, and might have exacted it of the principal, and Christ also might have refused to make such payment, because he was not in the obligation; These Reverend Divines, and divers others, do plainly see and acknowledge, that Christ was not our Surety in the same obligation with *Adam*.

Secondly, as Mr. *Norton* hath found out one clear Scripture, namely

namely, *Lev.*17.4. to prove that God doth impute sin properly to the offender; so if he could have found out another Scripture as clear, to prove, that God doth impute guilt to one that is no sinner, then he had hit the nayl upon the head; But as for that place he brings of *Philemon*, ver. 18. saying, *So might* Philemon *put* Onesimus *debt upon* Paul, it is not to the purpose, because it is but an instance of a civil imputation (not divine) from the meer voluntary cause in *Paul*, and not from the revenging justice of *Philemon*; of which voluntary offer much question might be made in a Court of Justice, how far *Paul* was obliged to suffer for *Onesimus*, whether any corporal punishment in kind, or whether a great sum of money (seeing *Paul* had a good warrant from Gods Law to moderate in this case, *Deut.*23.15.) Suppose that *Philemon* had demanded of *Paul* a thousand pound damage, would *Philemons* imposing this debt of a thousand pound to *Paul* in the behalf of the wrong done by *Onesimus*, have been accounted a just debt in a Court of Justice? who is able to cleer the intricacies of this instance? I beleeve this is no cleer instance for a Court of Justice to proceed by in such like cases, much lesse is it fit for the present dispute; For our dispute is about Gods imputing sin and guilt to man, or to the Mediator on mans behalf, and not about one mans imputing to another, which is but humane and civil. Phil.v.18.

If Mr. *Norton* had given but one Scripture-instance of a divine Imputation in the sense hee pleads for, hee had a fair opportunity to have done it, when he cited the other two places.

But seeing hee hath not done it, neither there, nor any where else, I beleeve he is not able to do it; and therefore for him to build so great weight upon this of *Philemon*, to prove that Christ was our guilty Surety, on whom God did justly inflict the Essential Torments of Hell, is to run himself, and his Reader, into a labyrinth of confused error.

That Preacher therefore saith *Tindal*, page 170. that bringeth a naked similitude to prove that which is contained in no text of Scripture, not followed of a Text, count a Deceiver, a Leader out of the way, and a false Prophet, and beware of his Philosophy and perswasions of mans wisdome, as *Paul* 1 *Cor.*2. saith, &c. for the reasons and similitudes of mans wisdome, make no faith, but wavering and uncertain opinions only; one

instance

instance of a divine imputation of sin to an innocent had confirmed the point, but a hundred such instances, of *Philemons* imputing of *Onesimus* debt to *Paul*, is nothing to the point.

If (saith Mr. *Wotton*) we take sin formally, then I deny that our sins were so imputed to Christ. His words at large I have recorded in my examination of 2 *Cor.* 5.21.

3 As for that Imputation by way of grace used ten times in *Rom.* the fourth,

I cannot but wonder at the citing of this Text to explicate that manner of Gods imputing our sins to Christ: surely *Rom.* 4. can have no respect of agreement to the Argument in hand; Therefore it is only cited to prove that the word impute is used in Scripture, as if any one that reads the Scripture were ignorant of it: but if any please to see the sense of the word Impute in *Rom.* 4. let them read Mr. *Wotton de Reconc. peccatoris part.* 2. *l.* 1. *c.* 15.

Rom. 4.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 25.

It is certain, that Christ was couched and comprehended in some part of the revealed will of God, during the first Covenant: It is very probable (saith he) *That the Tree of Life was a figure of Christ; And* (saith he) *If Christ be be not within the compasse of the Text, the Text is not true; And* (saith he) *Elect sinners, not dying in their own persons, must dye in their Surety, or else the Text should not be a truth.*

Reply 5. It hath been sufficiently shewed, I think, that Christ was not *Adams* Surety in the first Covenant.

2 Neither was Christ revealed to *Adam* as Mediator as yet;* Had Mr. *Norton* but consulted with Mr. *Shepherd* in his 178. and 133. *Thesis* on the Sabbath, he might have been better advised, than to say as he doth, that Christ was comprehended in some part of the revealed will of God, during the first Covenant, and that the Tree of Life was a typical figure of Christ; if he can find no better Arguments to prove that Christ was our Surety in the first obligation with *Adam*, he must be contented with his liberty to be fond of his conceited notion.

In vindiciæ legis lect 14. *p* 133. 135, 136

3 Mr. *Burges* also doth dispute against this Tenent of Mr. *Nortons*

Norton, and against such as hold a necessity of Christ to *Adam* in the time of his innocency.

4 Mr. *Ball* doth oppose it in his Book on the Covenant, page 9. 11. 13.

5 Mr. *Blake* on the Covenant saith thus in page 14. The first Covenant was immediate, no Mediator intervening; All the blessing of the first Covenant (saith he) flowed from the Trinity, as the creation it self did, without respect to Christ incarnate; there was no Revelation of that high mystery to man in innocency.

6 Mr. *Burges* saith, That all those that hold a necessity of Christ to *Adam* and Angels, must also necessarily maintain, that though *Adam* had not fallen, Christ would have been Incarnated. *In vindicia Legis* 135.

And this was the opinion of *Osiander*, That Christ had been Incarnate, though *Adam* had not sinned.

And truly, *Osiander* might as well maintain his opinion, as Mr. *Norton* may, That Christ was in the same obligation with *Adam* as his Surety in the first Covenant; he saith, That Elect sinners must dye in their Surety, or else the Text should not bee a truth; had he but said, or else I am mistaken, and have not given the right sense of the Text, then hee had spoken humbly and truly, and then I had believed him.

Ans. 6 Though hitherto I have denyed that Christ was our bounden Surety in the same obligation with *Adam*; yet this I do also acknowledge, that presently after *Adams* fall, he was declared to be *Adams* voluntary Surety, namely, to be his free Redeemer. Christ was our voluntary Surety, but not our bounden Surety in the same obligation with *Adam*.

For it pleased God to declare the Decree of the eternal Covenant that was agreed on between the Trinity for mans Redemption from Sathans Head-plot, in *Gen.* 3. 15. Gen. 3. 15.

1 God by way of Threatning told the Devil (in the hearing of *Adam* and *Eve*) That the seed of the deceived woman should over-match him at last, and should break in peeces his crafty Head-plot; and he gave the Devil leave to do his worst to hinder it, and for that purpose hee proclamed an utter enmity between them, and bid the Devill pierce him in the foot-soals as a wicked Malefactor on the Crosse, to disturb his patience, and so to pervert his obedience wherein the root of an acceptable sacrifice doth lye, that so his death might not be a sacrifice.

2 It is also manifest by the said Declaration, that Christ had Covenanted from Eternity to take upon him the seed of the Woman, and the sinlesse infirmities of our true humane nature, and in that nature, and with those infirmities to enter the lists with Sathan, and to continue obedient through all his afflictions, temptations and trials, to the death, even to the death of the Crosse, *Phil.*2.8,9.

3 It is also manifest by the said Declaration, That God the Father had Covenanted, that in case Christ did continue obedient through all his sufferings, temptations, and trials, that then his obedience through all his temptations and trials should bee accounted as the upshot of his Priestly Consecration; which indeed must be compleatly finished before he might make his soul a sacrifice; and it is out of controversie, that his sufferings were ordained for the perfecting of his Priestly Consecration, by *Heb.*2.10.17. with *Heb.*5.9. and therefore, as soon as ever hee had finished all his sufferings that were written of him, *He said, It is finished*, Joh.19.30. and then as a compleat Consecrated Priest he made his Sacrifice, saying, *Father, into thy hands I commend my Spirit*, and so he bowed his head, and gave up the Ghost. This last act was properly and formally his Death and Sacrifice, and it was properly and formally full satisfaction; and this powring out his vital soul, and rendring his immortal soul into the hands of God, was the act of his Eternal Spirit, *Heb.*9.14. Yea his Death & Sacrifice must be done by the joynt concurrence of both his natuear, or else he had not been the Mediator of the New Covenant through death, *Heb.*9.15,16. and then the Devils Head-plot had not been broken; but because hee continued obedient through all his sufferings on the Crosse, and at last made his Sacrifice by his own Priestly power, even by the joynt concurrence of both his Natures, he hath through that kind of death destroyed him that had the power of death, that is the Devil, *Heb.*2.14. and all this was declared unto *Adam* in *Gen.*3.15. and exemplified in the sacrifice of a Lamb; the Law maketh men High-priests which have infirmities, *Heb.*7.28. namely, sinful infirmities: But the word of the Oath (to *David*) which was since the Law, maketh the Son, who is consecrated for evermore, namely made perfect by his obedience in all his sufferings, and so hee had no sinful infirmity, but continues a perfect High-priest for us for evermore.

Heb 2.10.

Joh.19 30.

But

But this kind of voluntary Surety, doth differ as much from Mr. *Nortons* bounden Surety in the same Obligation with *Adam*, as a free Redeemer doth differ from a bounden Surety.

I grant therefore, that Christ was our Surety, as he was our free Mediator and Redeemer, but no otherwise; and so in an unproper sense he may be called our Surety, but not in a proper legal sense, according to Mr. *Nortons* Court-language.

This way of satisfaction, first declared in *Gen.* 3.15. is the foundation upon which all after Prophecies touching satisfaction by Christs death and sufferings must have dependence; and as it was first exemplified to *Adam* in the sacrifice of a Lamb, as I have shewed in the Institution of the Sabbath, and therefore all those positive Laws touching Priest and Sacrifice declared afterwards to *Moses*, are but the further opening of the manner of Christs satisfaction, and indeed those types were but the Picture of what was agreed on in the Eternal Covenant to bee performed in due time by the seed of the Woman.

4 It may hence be gathered, That God ordained no other afflictions for Christ to suffer, but either from Sathans enmity in piercing him in the foot-soals, meaning thereby his outward afflictions; Or else secondly, they were from himself in the inward man; for as he was true man of the seed of the Woman, so he must be inwardly touched with the feeling of our infirmities, and therefore as often as objects of fear or sorrow, &c. did present, he was to be touched, as our merciful High-priest, with a greater measure of these infirmities, than any other man can be; but no Scripture doth speak a word in Mr. *Nortons* Dialect, that his soul was pressed under the sense of Gods immediate wrath; for in case his Fathers immediate wrath had pressed those sorrows from his soul, as Mr. *Nortons* term is, then those sufferings had not been voluntary from his own will, but constrained; but say all sound Divines, nothing was constrained in Christ by any supreme power, and therefore not by Gods immediate wrath; though the Devil had liberty to use what force hee could to his outward man, yet hee had no liberty to force his soul, but himself was the only voluntary Agent in all the affections of his soul, hee feared, hee sorrowed, &c. when hee would, and as much as hee would, and therefore was often

instance of a divine imputation of sin to an innocent had confirmed the point, but a hundred such instances, of *Philemons* imputing of *Onesimus* debt to *Paul*, is nothing to the point.

If (saith Mr. *Wotton*) we take sin formally, then I deny that our sins were so imputed to Christ. His words at large I have recorded in my examination of 2 *Cor.* 5. 21.

3 As for that Imputation by way of grace used ten times in *Rom.* the fourth,

I cannot but wonder at the citing of this Text to explicate that manner of Gods imputing our sins to Christ: surely *Rom.* 4. can have no respect of agreement to the Argument in hand; Therefore it is only cited to prove that the word impute is used in Scripture, as if any one that reads the Scripture were ignorant of it: but if any please to see the sense of the word Impute in *Rom.* 4. let them read Mr. *Wotton de Reconc. peccatoris part.* 2. *l.* 1. *c.* 15.

Rom. 4.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 25.

It is certain, that Christ was couched and comprehended in some part of the revealed will of God, during the first Covenant: It is very probable (saith he) *That the Tree of Life was a figure of Christ; And* (saith he) *If Christ be be not within the compasse of the Text, the Text is not true; And* (saith he) *Elect sinners, not dying in their own persons, must dye in their Surety, or else the Text should not be a truth.*

Reply 5. It hath been sufficiently shewed, I think, that Christ was not *Adams* Surety in the first Covenant.

2 Neither was Christ revealed to *Adam* as Mediator as yet; Had Mr. *Norton* but consulted with Mr. *Shepherd* in his 178. and 133. *Thesis* on the Sabbath, he might have been better advised, than to say as he doth, that Christ was comprehended in some part of the revealed will of God, during the first Covenant, and that the Tree of Life was a typical figure of Christ; if he can find no better Arguments to prove that Christ was our Surety in the first obligation with *Adam*, he must be contented with his liberty to be fond of his conceited notion.

In vindicia legis lect 14. p 133. 135, 136

3 Mr. *Burges* also doth dispute against this Tenent of Mr. *Norton's*

Norton, and against such as hold a necessity of Christ to *Adam* in the time of his innocency.

4 Mr. *Ball* doth oppose it in his Book on the Covenant, page 9. 11. 13.

5 Mr. *Blake* on the Covenant saith thus in page 14. The first Covenant was immediate, no Mediator intervening; All the blessing of the first Covenant (saith he) flowed from the Trinity, as the creation it self did, without respect to Christ incarnate; there was no Revelation of that high mystery to man in innocency.

6 Mr. *Burges* saith, That all those that hold a necessity of Christ to *Adam* and Angels, must also necessarily maintain, that though *Adam* had not fallen, Christ would have been Incarnated. *Vindiciæ Legis* 135.

And this was the opinion of *Osiander*, That Christ had been Incarnate, though *Adam* had not sinned.

And truly, *Osiander* might as well maintain his opinion, as Mr. *Norton* may, That Christ was in the same obligation with *Adam* as his Surety in the first Covenant; he saith, That Elect sinners must dye in their Surety, or else the Text should not bee a truth; had he but said, or else I am mistaken, and have not given the right sense of the Text, then hee had spoken humbly and truly, and then I had believed him.

Ans. 6 Though hither to I have denyed that Christ was our bounden Surety in the same obligation with *Adam*; yet this I do also acknowledge, that presently after *Adams* fall, he was declared to be *Adams* voluntary Surety, namely, to be his free Redeemer. Christ was our voluntary Surety, but now our bounden Surety in the same obligation with *Adam*.

For it pleased God to declare the Decree of the eternal Covenant that was agreed on between the Trinity for mans Redemption from Sathans Head-plot, in *Gen.* 3. 15. *Gen.* 3. 15.

1 God by way of Threatning told the Devil (in the hearing of *Adam* and *Eve*) That the seed of the deceived woman should over-match him at last, and should break in peeces his crafty Head-plot; and he gave the Devil leave to do his worst to hinder it, and for that purpose hee proclamed an utter enmity between them, and bid the Devill pierce him in the foot-soals as a wicked Malefactor on the Crosse, to disturb his patience, and so to pervert his obedience wherein the root of an acceptable sacrifice doth lye, that so his death might not be a sacrifice.

2 It is also manifest by the said Declaration, that Christ had Covenanted from Eternity to take upon him the seed of the Woman, and the sinlesse infirmities of our true humane nature, and in that nature, and with those infirmities to enter the lists with Sathan, and to continue obedient through all his afflictions, temptations and trials, to the death, even to the death of the Crosse, *Phil.*2.8,9.

3 It is also manifest by the said Declaration, That God the Father had Covenanted, that in case Christ did continue obedient through all his sufferings, temptations, and trials, that then his obedience through all his temptations and trials should bee accounted as the upshot of his Priestly Consecration; which indeed must be compleatly finished before he might make his soul a sacrifice; and it is out of controversie, that his sufferings were ordained for the perfecting of his Priestly Consecration, by *Heb.*2.10.17. with *Heb.*5.9. and therefore, as soon as ever hee had finished all his sufferings that were written of him, *He said, It is finished*, Joh.19.30. and then as a compleat Consecrated Priest he made his Sacrifice, saying, *Father, into thy hands I commend my Spirit*, and so he bowed his head, and gave up the Ghost. This last act was properly and formally his Death and Sacrifice, and it was properly and formally full satisfaction; and this powring out his vital soul, and rendring his immortal soul into the hands of God, was the act of his Eternal Spirit, *Heb.*9.14. Yea his Death & Sacrifice must be done by the joynt concurrence of both his natures, or else he had not been the Mediator of the New Covenant through death, *Heb.*9.15,16. and then the Devils Head-plot had not been broken; but because hee continued obedient through all his sufferings on the Crosse, and at last made his Sacrifice by his own Priestly power, even by the joynt concurrence of both his Natures, he hath through that kind of death destroyed him that had the power of death, that is the Devil, *Heb.*2.14. and all this was declared unto *Adam* in *Gen.*3.15. and exemplified in the sacrifice of a Lamb; the Law maketh men High-priests which have infirmities, *Heb.*7.28. namely, sinful infirmities: But the word of the Oath (to *David*) which was since the Law, maketh the Son, who is consecrated for evermore, namely made perfect by his obedience in all his sufferings, and so hee had no sinful infirmity, but continues a perfect High-priest for us for evermore.

Heb 2.10.

Joh.19 30.

But

But this kind of voluntary Surety, doth differ as much from Mr. *Nortons* bounden Surety in the same Obligation with *Adam*, as a free Redeemer doth differ from a bounden Surety.

I grant therefore, that Christ was our Surety, as he was our free Mediator and Redeemer, but no otherwise; and so in an unproper sense he may be called our Surety, but not in a proper legal sense, according to Mr. *Nortons* Court-language.

This way of satisfaction, first declared in *Gen.*3.15. is the foundation upon which all after Prophecies touching satisfaction by Christs death and sufferings must have dependence; and as it was first exemplified to *Adam* in the sacrifice of a Lamb, as I have shewed in the Institution of the Sabbath, and therefore all those positive Laws touching Priest and Sacrifice declared afterwards to *Moses*, are but the further opening of the manner of Christs satisfaction, and indeed those types were but the Picture of what was agreed on in the Eternal Covenant to bee performed in due time by the seed of the Woman.

4 It may hence be gathered, That God ordained no other afflictions for Christ to suffer, but either from Sathans enmity in piercing him in the foot-soals, meaning thereby, his outward afflictions; Or else secondly, they were from himself in the inward man; for as he was true man of the seed of the Woman, so he must be inwardly touched with the feeling of our infirmities, and therefore as often as objects of fear or sorrow, &c. did present, he was to be touched, as our merciful High-priest, with a greater measure of these infirmities, than any other man can be; but no Scripture doth speak a word in Mr. *Nortons* Dialect, that his soul was pressed under the sense of Gods immediate wrath; for in case his Fathers immediate wrath had pressed those sorrows from his soul, as Mr. *Nortons* term is, then those sufferings had not been voluntary from his own will, but constrained; but say all sound Divines, nothing was constrained in Christ by any supreme power, and therefore not by Gods immediate wrath; though the Devil had liberty to use what force hee could to his outward man, yet hee had no liberty to force his soul, but himself was the only voluntary Agent in all the affections of his soul, hee feared, hee sorrowed, &c. when hee would, and as much as hee would, and therefore was often

touched with the feeling of our infirmities in a larger measure than any other mans soul can bee; and thus hee was our voluntary Mediator and Surety.

Mr. *Norton* still makes Christ to bee our legal Surety, in the same obligation with *Adam*: on the contrary, I do still affirm that Christ suffered our punishments, not from Gods judicial imputation of sin; for then indeed he had suffered from Gods wrath; but that he suffered our punishments, only from the voluntary Cause and Covenant; and such sufferings might be and were undertaken by Christ; both without any judicial imputation of sin, and also without wrath: as in the trial of masteries with Sathan, Enmity upon *Adams* fall was proclamed, and the seed of the Woman was commanded (but not in wrath) to enter the lists with Sathan, and try masteries with him, and the Devil must do his worst to disturb his patience, and so to pervert his obedience, and Christ must exemplifie the perfection of his obedience, by the perfection of his patience even in that ignominious and painful death of the Crosse, untill hee had finished all his sufferings for his consecration to his Priestly office; and then at last *make his soul a sacrifice for sin*. But this way of satisfaction Mr. *Norton* dams for heresie: The Lord open his eyes to see better, and the eyes of those that are misled by him.

5 It was ordained in the Eternal Decree and Covenant, that Christ should be consecrated to his Priestly office (for the better making his death a sacrifice) by afflictions, *Heb.*2.10. *Heb.* 5.9.

Heb.2.10. God ordained all Christs greatest sufferings in his Passion to be for his consecration to his sacrifice.

To consecrate, is interpreted by the Seventy, to make perfect: As for example, when the people had worshipped the Golden Calf, *Moses*, by Gods special positive command in *Exod.* 32. 27.29. commanded the Levites to consecrate their hands, by doing perfect and exact justice upon the Idolaters, without respect of persons, not sparing their own sons, or neer kindred; and this act of theirs is recorded to their praise in *Deut.*33.9. and by this impartial act of perfect justice their hands were consecrated to God.

2 The consecration of *Aaron* and his sons to the Priestly office, was to bee effected by continuing seven dayes under the observation of certain particular Rites before their consecration could bee finished, *Exod.*29.9. and *Lev.*8.22. and then the

the very next day after, their consecration was finished, *Moses* bid them draw near to the Altar to execute the Priests office, by offering a sacrifice both for themselves, and for the people, *Lev.* 9. 7. But Christ needed not to offer any sacrifice for himself, and therefore it was only for his people.

3 As *Moses* is said to consecrate *Aaron* and his sons through many particular Rites exactly observed, whereof one was no small affliction (though willingly born by them at the Lords appointment) namely, *Yee shall abide at the door of the Tent of the Congregation day and night, seven dayes, and shall keep the charge of Jehovah, that ye dye not*, Lev. 8. 33. This exact watch, for that space of time being separated from their wives and families, under the penalty of death, was doubtlesse a time of affliction to them, though, as I said before, willingly born at the Lords appointment.

4 It is said in *Heb.* 2. 10. *It became him*, namely, it became God the Father, *that hee should consecrate the Prince of our salvation through afflictions*. And it is also said in verse 17. *That it behoved Christ to bee made like unto his brethren, that he might bee a merciful and a faithful high Sacrificer in things concerning God, and that hee might make Reconciliation for the sins of the people.*

5 In these two verses we may observe the execution of some of the Articles of the Eternal Covenant touching Christs Priesthood, both on the Fathers part, and on Christs part.

1 It is said of the Father, *That it became him to consecrate the Prince of our salvation through afflictions*; that is, to make his obedience perfect through afflictions; or else if the Devil had not had full liberty to try his obedience by afflictions, hee would have objected thus against Christ; In case I might have had full liberty to try his obedience, as I had to try *Adams* obedience, this seed of the Woman would have been disobedient to God, as *Adam* was; Therefore it became so perfect a Work-man as God was, to declare that Sathan had full liberty to enter the Lists with the seed of the Woman, and to do his worst to pervert his obedience, *Gen.* 3. 15.

And secondly, *It behoved Christ, to be made like unto his brethren*, and to enter the Lists with Sathan, not in his divine nature, but in our nature, and to be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, and therefore it is also said, *That it behoved Christ to suffer*

Luke 24.46. according to the Decree and Covenant declared in *Gen.*3,15. that so his obedience being made perfect, he might bee fully consecrated to the execution of his Priestly office in making his Soul an acceptable Sacrifice to make Reconciliation for the sins of Gods people, and thus hee became obedient to the death, *Phi.*2.8.

And thus it became God to consecrate, and Christ to be consecrated through afflictions, and therefore presently after the Fall, God said to Sathan, Thou shalt pierce him in the foot-soals; and accordingly God is said not to spare his own Son, but to deliver him up into the hands of Sathan, for us all, to try the combate, *Rom.*8.32. So *David* said, The Lord bade *Shemei* to curse *David*: For saith Dr *Preston* in Gods All-Sufficiency, There is no creature in heaven or earth that stirreth without a command, and without a warrant from the Master of the house. God sent Sathan to bee a lying spirit in the mouth of *Ahabs* false Prophets; God is without all causes, and the cause of all things; no creature stirs but at his command, and by his providence, *Eccles.*3.14. And thus *Herod* and *Pontius Pilate*, the Devils Agents, did unto Christ, whatsoever God had before determined to be done, *Act.*4. and thus God declared his will to Sathan, Thou shalt pierce the seed of the deceived Woman in the foot-soals, as a wicked Malefactor; but yet for all this, he shall continue obedient, and at last break thy Head-plot by his sacrifice of Reconciliation; flesh and blood could not effect this way of consecration. The Father delivered Christ to death, saith *P. Mart.* not that the Father is bitter or cruel, hee delighted not in evil, as it is evil: But I may adde, he delighted to see him combate with Sathan, not for the evil sake that fel upon Christ, but for the good of his obedience in his consecration to his death and sacrifice. And all this was done not from the row of causes, as in Courts of justice from the imputation of the guilt of our sins; but from the voluntary Cause and Covenant only.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in Page 130.

The soul that sinneth shall dye, Ezek.18.20. *God* (saith he) *man sinned*, ergo, *man dyed*; *Christ was a sinner imputatively, though not inherently*; *And the soul that sinneth, whether inherently or imputatively, shall dye.*

Reply 7.

Reply 7. It is a plain evidence that the Doctrine of imputing our sins to Christ as our legal Surety, is a very unsound Doctrine, because it hath no better supports hitherto than Scripture miſ-interpreted. The ſenſe of this Text is this; *The ſoul that ſins, i. e.* the very ſoul that ſins, namely, the very ſame numerical and individual perſon, that ſins formaly and inherently, *ſhall die*; for the text ſpeaks plainly of ſin committed, and it argues that Mr. *Norton* took little heed to the circumſtances of the Text, that did not mark that; and the Text ſheweth the effect that ſin hath upon a ſinner (that repents not) namely, he ſhall dye.

Now to this Expoſition compare Mr. *Nortons* Anſwer; *Man ſinned* (ſaith he) (mark his evaſion,) for he doth not ſpeak this of man numetically taken, as the Text doth, but he ſpeaks it of man generally, or of all mankind in *Adam*; *Ergo, man died* (ſaith he) here he takes the word man, not for the particular individual ſinner, as the Text doth, but for the individual perſon of Chriſt; and ſo his meaning amounts to this, Mankind ſinned, and Chriſt died. By this the Reader may ſee that his Expoſition agrees with the Text, no better than Harp and Harrow.

Therefore unleſs Mr. *Norton* do affirm that Chriſt was a ſinner formally and inherently, he cannot from this place of *Ezekiel* gather that Chriſt was to ſuffer the ſecond death; neither can he gather it from *Gen.* 2.17. becauſe both theſe places ſpeak of ſin as it is formally committed, and not alone of the effects of ſin (as guilt.) Neither of theſe Scriptures do admit of dying by a Surety; neither doth the Law any where elſe admit of dying ſuch a death as the ſecond death is, by a Surety, to deliver other ſinners from that death, as theſe Scriptures do teſtifie, *Pſ.* 49.7,8,9. *Job* 36. 18,19.

The Apoſtle ſaith, *the ſting of death is ſin*, but his meaning is plainly of ſin inherent, and not of ſuch an imputation of ſin as Mr. *Norton* makes to be the ground of Chriſts ſuffering the ſecond death.

Adams *firſt ſin*, ſaith Bucanus, *was common to all mens nature; but his other ſins*, ſaith he, *were truly perſonal, of which Ezek.* 18.20. the ſoul that ſinneth ſhall die.

But I wonder that Mr. *Norton* doth cite *Auſtin* for the ſpiritual death

death of Christs soul from Gods imputing our sins to him, *Austin* (saith he in p. 130.) *calleth it a death, not of condition, but of crime*; it is as evident as the sun, that *Austins* meaning is this, Christ was not necessitated to die through any sinful condition of nature, as fallen man is; but that he was put to death as a criminal person by the Jews sinful imputations; and that *Austin* infers, it was therefore just, that seeing the devil had slain him who owed nothing, the debtors whom he held in durance, beleeving in him that was slain without cause, should be set at liberty; See *Austins* sense more at large in *Wotton de Recon. spec. par.* 2. *l.* 1. *c.* 21. *Austins* sense is no more like Mr. *Nortons* sense, than an Apple is like an Oyster.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in pag. 41.

If Christ had suffered death without guilt imputed, his death could not have been called a punishment.

All Christs sufferings were from the voluntary Covenant, and not from Gods judicial imputation of our sins to him.

Reply 8. If Mr. *Norton* from the Voluntary cause and covenant should undertake to strive with his opposite Champion for the mastery, according to the Rules of the said voluntary Law, I beleeve that he should by experience find that he must bear many a sour stroak, and brush, and it may be, shed much blood, which I think would be accounted a true punishment (though it be not a vindictive punishment from the sense of an angry Judge) and yet all this without any imputation of sin from the Superiors in the voluntary Covenant, unless he should disobey their Laws in the manner of trial; in like sort, God told the Decree in *Gen.* 3.15. that he would put enmity between Christ and the Devil, and that the Devil should drive hard at him all the time that he executed his Office, and that at last the Devil should prevail so far as to pierce him in the foot-soals as a sinful Malefactor, and it pleased the Lord thus to bruise him, and put him to grief, *Is.* 53.10. even at the same time when he should make his soul a sin. The Lord took much delight and pleasure to behold the knowledge, and skil, the valor and wisdom of this his righteous servant, in this conflict continuing obedient to the death, according to all the Articles of the Covenant, untill he had triumphed over all Principalities and Powers on his

Gen 3.15.

cross;

cross, and so he won the prize, namely, the salvation of all the Elect.

According to this way of punishment, Christ suffered our punishments; no punishment was due to him from the imputation of sin; and therefore no punishment was inflicted on him from Gods anger, as our punishments are: We indeed do justly suffer, according to that Court-language which Mr. *Norton* hath expressed; but Christs punishments, though they were as true punishments in sense and feeling as ours are (and more sensible to his nature, than to us) yet they were not inflicted on him from the same compulsory ground and Law as ours are on us; but all his were from the voluntary Law and Covenant, as I have before declared. And in chap. 12. at Conclus. 1. I have shewed, that any imputation of sin in the voluntary combate doth lose the prize.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in pag. 96.

Christ is expresly said to be made a curse, Gal. 3. 13. *It will thence unavoydably follow* (saith he) *that sin was some way judicially upon Christ; for we read of no curse inflicted according to the determinate and revealed way of proceeding with the reasonable creature, but it presupposeth sin; wherefore he could neither have been made a curse, nor die; since the onely cause of the curse and death is sin, from which he was free, but because he had taken upon him our sins.*

Reply 9. *Sin*, saith Mr. Norton, *was some way judicially upon Christ*; Why then is it not proved and made manifest by Scripture? I find no other proof of it, but Scripture mis-interpreted, as I have shewed already; and as for *Gal.* 3. 13. it doth clearly faile him, as the Reader may see in my examination of his Conclusions from the Text.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in pag. 55.

God charged Christ with sin as the supreme Law-giver and Judge, Christ accepts the charge as a Surety, and so subjects himself to the satisfaction of Justice, which is the part of a Surety.

And in the said page, *God cannot be just without a judicial im-*

putation of the guilt and punishment of sin unto the Surety.
And in pag. 34, 28, and 136. he saith, *It was requisite that Christ should be made sin, i.e. that the guilt of sin should be legally imputed to him*, 2 Cor. 5. 21.

Reply 10. These speeches, and others, do imply, that God could not impute our sins to Christ, unless he had been first a legal Surety in the same obligation with *Adam*; but that hath been all along denied and disproved; and therefore now, except Mr. *Norton* can more clearly prove, than hitherto, that Christ was a true legal Surety in the same obligation with *Adam*, All that he hath said hitherto about Gods imputing our sins to Christ, will come to nothing: As for his great proof, that Christ was such a legal Surety, from *Heb.* 7. 22. it shall have a full examination and reply in my Reply to his third Argument, and touching his many proofs of imputation from 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. See more there.

But saith Mr. *Norton* pag. 70.

Through anguish of soul he had clods, rather than drops of blood streaming down his blessed body, a thing which was neither seen nor heard before nor since; The true reason thereof is, Christ died as a sinner imputatively pressed under the sense of the wrath of God, and conflicting with eternal death.

Reply 11. Touching his sweating clods of blood I have replyed, in *Luk.* 22. 44. if it were clods of blood, doubtless, it was miraculous, and if it were miraculous, how is that a proof that it was caused from the pressure of the sense of Gods wrath?

But I beleeve his Agony was from natural causes, namely, because his pure nature did so much abhor that ignominious, and painful death, which he did grapple withall in the garden; and I beleeve, if Mr. *Norton* had made his Agony to proceed from the voluntary cause, conflicting in his earnest prayers with Satans temptations, and with the natural fear of death, untill he had overcome that natural fear, that so he might perform his oblation in all exact obedience according to Gods positive Covenant,

nant, he had come far nearer to the true cauſe of Chriſts Agony, than by making his Agony to proceed from the compulſory cauſe. *Being preſſed under the wrath of God*; it ſeems his word preſſing doth allude to that violent conſtraint that is uſed to preſs out the blood of grapes; but yet it is alſo beyond it, becauſe he makes the wrath of God to preſs out clods of blood in Chriſt; it makes me tremble at ſuch expreſſions of violence from Gods immediate wrath againſt Chriſt.

But ſaith Mr. *Norton* in pag. 219.

As Chriſt was guilty of our ſin, ſo alſo he was ſenſible of an accuſing conſcience; and a little after, ſaith he, *the queſtion is not, whether Chriſt be polluted with our ſin inherently, but whether he may not be ſaid to be polluted with our ſin imputatively.*

Reply 12. In words Mr. *Norton* ſaith, Chriſt was not guilty of our ſins inherently; but his arguing doth prove him a ſinner inherently; for his whole drift is, to prove that Chriſt ſuffered the eſſential torments of hell and the ſecond death, and none can poſſible ſuffer the ſecond death, until they be firſt inherently guilty of the firſt death of ſin.

2 If he was polluted with our ſin by Gods imputation, as Mr. *Norton* holds, then his death, and ſacrifice muſt needs be abominable in the ſight of God,

But ſaith Mr. *Norton* in pag. 123.

The Divine Nature was angry, not onely with the Humane Nature, but with the perſon of the Mediator, becauſe of ſin imputed to him.

Reply 13. Mark the dangerouſneſs of this Doctrine of imputing our ſins to Chriſt; for here Mr. *Norton* makes God to be angry with Chriſt becauſe of ſin imputed to him as to our Mediator in both his Natures, and ſo all along he makes Chriſt as God Man to be our Surety, and ſo ſin to be imputed to him in both his Natures. But Mr. *Burges* on *Juſtific.* p. 176. ſaith, *That Chriſt as God Man, was not bound by any imputation of our guilt*; And he cites *Zanchy* for this. The fore-quoted Author (ſaith he)

makes this objection to himself, How Christ could be said to be freed from the guilt of sin who had no sin? He answereth, the person of Christ is considered two waies, 1. In it self as God Man, and so Christ was not bound by any guilt; 2. as appointed Head, and so representing our persons, in this respect God laid our iniquities upon him, *Isa.*53. My drift in citing this, is to shew, That such learned Divines as *Zanchy* and Mr. *Burges* is, do deny that the guilt of our sins were imputed to Christ as God Man, contradicting Mr. *Norton* therein.

Christ in his obeying (saith *P. Martyr* in his Ser. on *Phi.*2.) became not less than his Father, as touching his God-head, he obeyed as a friend towards a friend, and not as an inferior unto death: The Lord of life submitted himself to death, and being immortal he died. How contrary is this of *P. Martyr*, to Mr. *Nortons* kind of imputation? Surely by Mr. *Nortons* imputation of sin to the Mediator in both his Natures, the God-head of Christ did not obey as a Friend to his Friend to the death, as *P. Martyr* saith, but as a Delinquent to the supreame Judge to the death, is not this kind of imputation good Divinity?

Now let the judicious Reader judge, whether some of these expressions do not exceed the bounds of his said third Distinction; for there he makes the imputation of guilt, to be the obligation to punishment: But in sundry of those speeches of his, which I have repeated, he goes further, than I beleeve most men could imagine, by his said Distinction; and he doth all along make Christs sufferings to be from the imputation of sin, that so he might deserve hell-torments, and the second death, according to the exact order of Courts of Justice in their proceedings in criminal causes.

In Rev. 4. p 49. Christs sufferings were not inflicted on him according to the natural order of Justice by imputation of sin. But from the voluntary cause.

Some Philosophers, saith Mr. *Traherne*, do teach that all things come to pass by the copulation of causes wrapped up one in another, and so they make God subject to the order and row of causes depending upon each other. But (saith he) we say, that all things come to pass, because God through his secret will and purpose hath ordered them so to be done as they are done.

Ibidem, saith he, the later Schoolmen say truly, that all things come to pass necessarily, not by the necessity of natural causes, but by the necessity of Gods Ordinance, which they call *necessitatem consequentis*.

And

And saith *P. Martyr* in *Rom.*5. p.124. God is not to be compelled to order, neither ought he to be ordered by humane Laws; But Mr. *Norton* doth all along put Christs sufferings into the order of Justice, according to the order of humane Courts and Laws, namely, by infliction of punishment from the imputation of sin.

And saith *P. Martyr* in p. 111. It is much to be marvelled at how the *Pelagians* can deny that there is original sin in Infants, seeing they see that they daily die; but (saith he) here ought we to except Christ only, who, although he knew not sin, yet died he for our sakes; But death had not dominion over him, because that he of his own accord suffered it for our sakes. And the like speech of his I have cited in chap.10. at Reply 2. By which speeches it is evident, that *Peter Martyr* could not hold the imputation of our sins to Christ, as Mr. *Norton* doth, but he held that Christ bore our sins, namely, our punishments, according to the antient Orthodox, and no otherwise, and that phrase and sense is according to the Scriptures, 1 *Pet.*2.24. but that sense is very far from the sense of Mr. *Nortons* imputation, for the first sort agrees to the voluntary cause, but Mr. *Nortons* kind must be ranked with the compulsory cause of Christs sufferings, according to Courts of justice.

But I would fain know of Mr. *Norton*, what was the sin that God imputed to *Isaak*, for which he commanded *Abraham* to kill his Son for a sacrifice, did not God command it rather for the trial of *Isaaks* obedience, as well as of *Abrahams*? for in that act of obedience *Abraham* was the Priest, and *Isaack* was the Sacrifice, and in that act both of them were a lively type of the obedience of Christ, who was both Priest and Sacrifice in his own death and Sacrifice; doubtless, if *Abraham* had killed *Isaack*, it had not been from the imputation of any sin to him, but in obedience to a voluntary positive command of God, and not to a moral command from sin imputed, for then it had been grounded on the copulation of causes wrapped one in another, as Mr. *Norton* would have Christs death to be; but the Scripture imputes no sin to Christ, but makes him the Holy one of God in all his sufferings.

In our judging of the ways of God (saith Dr. *Preston*, in his Treatise of *God without causes*, p.143.) we should take heed of

framing a model of our own, as to think, that because such a thing is just, therefore the Lord wills it; The reason of this conceit (saith he) is, because we think that God must go by our rule; we forget this, That every thing is therefore just, because the Lord doth first will it, and not that God doth will it, because it is first just; but we must proceed in another manner, we should first find out what the will of God is, for in that is the rule of Justice and Equity. So far Dr. *Preston.*

And it is now manifested, that the Rule of God from eternity, was, that Christ should be the seed of the woman to break the Devils head-plot by his blessed Sacrifice, and that he should be such a High Priest as is holy and harmless, and separated from sinners, and that he should be a Lamb without spot and blemish, and therefore without all imputation of sin in the sight of God, and of his Law, and that he should be consecrated through afflictions, *Heb.*2.10. and 5.9. and 10.20. and to this end should, as a voluntary Combater, enter the Lists with Satan, &c. as aforesaid.

And all this may be further cleared, if we consider what kind of cause Christs death is, to take away our sins; it is (saith M. *Burges*) a meritorious cause (in his *just.* p. 190.) which is in the rank of moral causes, of which the rule is not true, *Posità causâ sequitur effectus*; This holdeth in natural causes, which produce their effects; But (saith he) moral causes work according to the agreement and liberty of the persons that are moved thereby; as for example, God the Father is moved through the death of Christ, to pardon the sins of such persons for whom he dieth; so this rule must be applyed to the voluntary and eternal Covenant, and also to the event, as from the voluntary cause.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

His Fifth Distinction Examined, which is this:

Distinguish between a Penal Hell, and a Local Hell, Christ suffered a Penal Hell, but not a Local Hell.

Reply 1. THis Distinction makes two Hells, that have the same Essential Torments, one Temporary, and the other Eternal; one for Christ alone in this world, and the other for Reprobates in the world to come. By the like Reason there are two Heavens that have the same Essential blessednesse, the one Temporary, and the other Eternal; for if Scripture may be judge, there are as many Heavens for Essential blessednesse, as there are Hells for Essential torment.

I think the judicious Reader may well smile at this odde Distinction; and yet I do not see how Mr. *Norton* can maintain, that Christ suffered the Essential Torments of Hell, without this Distinction.

This penal Hell was first devised, and is still maintained, for the sake of Christs sufferings only; I never heard it used in Mr. *Nortons* sense for any body else, no not for the Devils themselves as long as they are in this world: For first, saith Mr. *Norton* in page 124. the full Torments of Hell are not inflicted upon the Devils before the day of Judgement. Secondly, neither dares he affirm that any man in this life did ever suffer the Essential torments of Hell: For in page 115. (he saith) That the reason why Eternal death is inflicted after the separation of the soul from the body, is, partly because of the inability of the nature of man in this present state of mortality to indure the wrath of God without separation of the soul from the body; namely, to indure Gods penal wrath (as hee doth presently after call it) such as Christ bare: And in Chap. 13. he saith,

It is a meer fantacy to say that Christ suffered the essential Torments of hell in this world, seeing it is acknowledged by Mr. *Norton*, That the Devils are not in full Torments here.

saith, There may be some doubt concerning the capacity of a meer creature, to hold such a measure of Torment.

1 Hence it follows from his own confession, that no mortal man can suffer the penal wrath of God, or the Essential Torments of hell in this life.

2 Hence it follows, that there is no such penal Hell for any other in this life, but for Christ alone.

3 That none (but Christ) can dye the second Death, till they be first dead in sin.

4 Neither dares Mr. *Norton* affirm, that Christ suffered the Essential Torments of Hel in this penal Hell by Gods ordinary dispensation: For in Page 120. he saith, *That according to the ordinary dispensation of God, the full paine of hell are not suffered in this life: But* (saith he) *according to the extraordinary dispensation of God, Christ not onely could, but did suffer the paine of Hell in this life.*

And truly, seeing this penal Hell hath need of miracles to support it, it shall have my vote to be matched with Purgatory, as a like fiction.

SECT. 2.

But Mr. *Norton* labours to confirm his said Distinction three wayes.

1 By a compartive Argument.
2 By the Testimony of the School-men.
3 By *Psal.* 16. 10.

1 His comparative Argument is this; *Christ might as well suffer the paines of Hell out of Hell, as partake of the joyes of Heaven out of Heaven.* His words in page 119. are these; *As the Manhood of Christ was partaker of the joyes of Heaven out of the place of Heaven, as* Luke 9. 28. *(if not at other times, yet after the Resurrection) so might it suffer the paine of Hell out of the place of Hell.*

Reply 2. His sense of Hell-torments must all along bee remembred to bee the Essential torments of Hell; For according to his first Distinction in page 8. he saith, That the

the essential part was that, and onely, that which Christ suffered; In like sort he must be understood that Christ did partake of the Essential joyes of Heaven out of Heaven, by *Luke* 9. 28. and then I beleeve his body had been glorified, and so consequently confirmed against the suffering of death; for if his Man-hood had partaken of the essential joyes of Heaven, then hee must bee cloathed with such essential glory as himself doth mention in *Joh.* 17. 5. *Glorifie me with thy self*; and in vers. 24. *That they may behold my glory which thou hast given me*; or else he reasons impertinently, and not to the point in hand: And thus hee hath abused the sense of *Luke* 9 28.

Luke 9. 28. Who ever is partaker of the essential joyes of heaven is confirmed against the suffering of death.

If he had affirmed these suffrings of Christ, and these glorious Revelations, in a metaphorical sense, then hee might have accorded with the Scripture sense, for great joyes by an hyperbole may well bee called the joyes of Heaven, but not the Essential joyes; neither do I beleeve that the Man-hood of Christ did partake of the Essential joyes and glory of Heaven, till he came there; neither doth that place in *Luke* 9. 28. nor any other Scripture prove it.

2 Mr. *Norton* doth labour to confirm his said Distinction by the School-men; For in page 120. hee saith, The founder School-men teach that Christ was in such a penal Hell, namely, where he suffered the Essential torments of Hell before his death; But in case the School-men did not teach so much, then Mr. *Norton* doth wrong both them, and the Reader, to cite them to his sense. But according to my learning they were far from Mr. *Nortons* Tenent.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 39. *The soul is understood by judicious Authors properly; Hell metaphorically, for pains equivalent to the pains of Hell it self.*

Reply. I confesse, I cannot but wonder that Mr. *Norton* doth so often use the word Equivalent, seeing his fundamental principle is, That Christ suffered the very Essential Torments of Hell, and yet ever and anon hee is glad to flye to the word Equivalent in the point of satisfaction, and yet he doth oppose the use of it in the point of satisfaction in the Dialogue. Hee said in page 8

Mr. *Norton* flies from his foundation principle of essential torments, to that which is equavalent.

That the Essential part of Hell torments was that, and only that, which Christ suffered.

But here he is forced to leave that Principle, and to flye to that which is Equivalent; sometimes he holds close to the very letter of the Law, as if God could not alter one jot, because Christ was in the same obligation with *Adam*, but presently after, hee doth admit of the word Equivalent; such uncertainty there is in his foundation-principles.

The metaphorical sense of *Sheol* & *Haides*.

2 The metaphorical sense of Hell may bee thus considered, *Sheol* in the Old Testament is alwayes translated by the Seventy into *Haides* or *Hades*, except in one place, and there it is translated *Thanatos*, death; the word in both languages is of large signification, and it may be ranked into these senses; First, It signifies sorrows and afflictions. Secondly, Death, to the person. Thirdly, The Grave, to the body. Fourthly, The world of souls, to the souls departed; namely, to the godly soul, Paradise, and to the wicked, *Gehenna*; for as *Buxer* saith in *Luke* 16. neither doth the word *Sheol* or *Hades* signifie the eternal estate of them that dye, whether they bee faithful, and go to heaven, or unfaithful, and go to hell; but *Hades* is first used for the hell of the damned, in *Luke* 16. 2. Secondly, For the penal hell of the godly, in suffering persecutions and afflictions, in *Matth.* 16. the Gates of *Haides* shall not prevail against them.

3 It is used for soul-sorrows, when a godly soul is deprived of the sense of the good of the promises for a time, and I have noted in the first Distinction; one may be in the Hell of conscience (saith Mr. *Wilson* in his mystical cases, p. 188.) who shall never come into the hell of the damned; But saith Mr. *Rutherfurd* in Christ dying, page 35. 39. The hel in the soul of Gods children, and the hell of the Reprobate, differ in Essence and Nature.

Buxer in Mat. 27. 43.

4 *Buxer* makes Christs bodily death to be penal Hell, his words, translated by *Catlisle*, speak thus; The ancient Fathers make no mention of *Limbus* or *Purgatory*; Let us (saith he) let this passe as the inventions of men; and let us rather give thanks to the Lord, who hath thrust his own Son into *infernum*, that is to say (saith he) that willed him to dye truly, that by his death we might be delivered.

Two things are obsetvable in the words of *Buxer*.

2 That

1 That he calls the bodily death of Christ, *Infernum*, or *Hell*.

2 That he ascribes our deliverance from hell, to the true bodily death of Christ.

5 I grant that Christ suffered the sorrows of *Sheol* and *Hades* in a Metaphorical sense, but in no sense did he suffer the sorrows of *Gehenna*, and that is the word that is properly meant of Hell torments; so that by Mr. *Norton*, Christ must suffer the Essential torments of *Gehenna*, in a penal *Gehenna* in this world. Of which see *Mar.*9.43.45.

6 Mr. *Norton* by his distinction of a local and penal Hell, doth much favour the opinion of the *Albanenses*, whose fourth Heresie was this, That in Hell there are no other pains than bee in this world; and Mr. *Norton* holds, that there are no other essential pains than what Christs suffered in this world: The opinions are very neer a kin, though in other matters I esteem Mr. *Norton* far afore them. See *Marbeck's* Com pl. p 22.

SECT. 3.

3. MR. *Norton* labours to confirm his said distinction of a local and penal Hell, by this Scripture, *Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hell*; this is cited in *Psal.*16.10. and in *Act.*2.27. The soul, saith he, in page 39. is understood by judicious and learned Authors properly, Hell Metaphorically, for such pains as are equivalent to the pains of Hell it self. But yet Mr. *Norton* doth fully contradict and confute both himself and his learned and judicious Authors; for in page 110. he saith, That the word *Hades* in the Creed is doubtlesse to bee interpreted according to some sense wherein it is used in the Scripture; But saith he in *Acts* 2.27. *It is taken for the Grave.* Here he affirms it is taken for the Grave, and yet in the place fore-cited, he saith, It is taken for the pains of Hell it self, by the judgement of learned and judicious Authours. I confesse I cannot but wonder that hee should make hell in one and the same text to signifie such different things; it is a manifest testimony of the uncertainty of his judgement. Psal.16.10. Act 2.27. It is to admiration that Mr. *Norton* doth interpret Hell in the same Scripture, first to signifie Hell torments, and then only the the Grave.

2 If *Haides* in Greek, and *Sheol* in Hebrew; and *Hell* in English, signifie no more but the Grave in the said Scriptures, then

I wonder how Mr. *Norton* can interpret the word Soul properly, of the immortal Soul of Christ, as he doth with the approbation of learned and judicious Authors; Doth the same Scripture in the same words, affirm that Christs immortal Soul did one while suffer the pains of hell in this life, and another while lye buried with his body in the Grave? Is not this to make the holy Scripture to be no better than a leaden Rule to bee bowed this way, & that way, after the fantasies of men at their pleasures?

He tells mee in page 258. That the Scripture lyeth not in the sound of words, but in the sense; but in this hee doth halt of his own sore, and therefore I retort his own words to himself, that most pestilent Doctrines have oftentimes been communicated in the language of the Scripture, &c.

3 Saith Mr. *Norton* in page 39. The soul in *Psal.* 16.10. and *Act.* 2.27. is by judicious and learned Authors understood properly; If Mr. *Norton* do approve the judgement of those learned and judicious Authors to the Reader, why then doth he in page 110. take Hell for the Grave; was his soul (properly taken) buried in his Grave? Secondly, why doth Mr. *Norton* blind the Reader, by saying that learned and judicious Authors do take the word Soul properly? seeing hee cannot be ignorant that other learned and judicious Authors take the word Soul there for the vital soul only, that liveth and dyeth with the body, & that soul might be dislocated in his body when he dyed, and so it might be buried with his body in the grave.

Mr. *Ainsw.* on the word Soul in *Psal.* 16.10. in his conclusion saith thus, Compare it (namely this word Soul) with the like in other places, as *Psal.* 30.4. *Psal.* 116.8. and *Psal.* 89.49. and 88.4. and 94.17. (all which places are clearly meant of the vital soul) and then hee makes application of this to Christ: Christ (saith he) gave his soul for the Ransome of the world, and powred it out to death, *Isa.* 53.12. *Mat.* 20.28. *Joh.* 10.11, 15, 17. and 15.13. and at the last he saith thus, these words, *Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell*, teach us Christs Resurrection; as if he should say, *Thou wilt not leave me to the power of Death, or Grave, to be consumed.* Mark this close of Mr. *Ainsworths*, hee interprets Hell to bee Death, or the Grave.

2 Mr. *Broughton*, in his two Works defensive, expounds *Psal.* 16.10. thus, *Thou wilt not leave my vital soul to Death*; In these words

words he expounds Christs soul to be his vital soul, and *Sheol*, Hell, to be Death (as *Bucer* did at fourthly above) *Thou wilt not leave my vital soul to Death*, and by a consequent (saith *Bro.*) nor my body in the Grave, nor my soul among souls, till my body see corruption.

And in his explication of the Article of *Descent into Hell*, page 16. he saith thus, *Peter* and *Paul* both citing this 16. *Psalm*, do cite it to no further death then that which all must feel.

3 Mr. *Carlisle* saith thus on *Psal.* 16. 10. *Thou wilt not leave* Nephes, *my body in the Grave*, for indeed the vital soul is a part of the body; and thus speaks our larger Annotations on *Psal.* 16. 10. I confesse it is to my admiration that Mr. *Norton* should commend that exposition of the word Soul, for Christs immortal soul, properly, and yet by *Sheol*, and *Haides* doth understand no more but the Grave in page 110. And thus you see that Mr. *Norton* hath confounded his own Distinction.

In his book against Christs local Descent. p. 32.

The soul in the N. T. is often put for the vital soul.

The Hebrew *Nephesh*, and the Greek *Psuche*, which we call Soul, saith *Ainsworth*, in Ps. 16. 10. hath the name of Breathing and Respiring; and (saith he) it is the vital spirit that all quick things move by, therefore beasts, birds, fish, and creeping things, are called *Living souls*, *Gen.* 1. 20. 24. and this soul is sometimes called *The blood*, *Gen.* 9. 4. because it is in the blood of all quick things, *Lev.* 17. 11. 2 *Christopher Carlisle* proves on the Article of *Descent*, page 144. 153. that *Nephesh* is never used for the immortal soul in all the Old Testament; and saith Dr. *Hammond* in 1 *Thes.* 5. 23. *Psuche*, the soul, doth ordinarily in the New Testament signifie *The life*; and saith *Carlisle* in p. 155. *Psuchee* doth signifie the immortal soul but in three places, namely, in *Mat.* 10. 27, 28. *Jam.* 1. 21. 1 *Pet.* 1. 9 and (saith he) in the New Testament it signifies for the most part that which *Nephes* doth in the Old.

And secondly, he makes it to signifie the fear of death in Christs humane nature, in *Mat.* 26. 38. *Mar.* 14. 34.

But thirdly, Though *Neshemah* doth also signifie the vital soul, yet tis never used for the vital soul of the unreasonable creatures, as *Nephesh* is, but only of man, and therefore the Hebrews do often understand by it the immortal or the rational soul. See *Aben Ezra* upon *Eccles.* 3. 21. 7. 5. And saith *Carlisle* in p. 162. *Neshemah* hath its name of *Shamaim* Heaven, for that the immortal soul cometh from Heaven.

cujus contra: vid gen: 7. 22.

These things considered, I think Mr. *Norton* hath but little ground to perswade his Reader from his learned Author, that the word Soul in *Psal.*16.10. is to be understood properly of the immortal Soul of Christ.

CHAP. VIII.

The Examination of Mr. *Nortons* eight Arguments.

His first Argument is this, in Page 10.

Either Christ suffered the Justice of God, instead of the Elect, denounced against sin, Gen. 2.17. *or God might dispence with the Execution thereof, without the violation of his Justice.*

But God could not dispence with the Execution thereof without the violation of his Justice.

Reply 1. BOth Propositions are unsound.

1 The *major*, because hee presupposeth from *Gen.*2.17. That Christ was included in the first Covenant, as *Adams* Surety, in the same Obligation with him.

This hath been denied and answered several times; and indeed the plain letter of the text doth directly out-face it, both in *Gen.*2.17. and in *Deut.*27. *Gal.*3.10. *Ezek.*18 4.&c. All these places do directly threaten the sinner himself only.

Gen.2.17.

Yea some Divines that hold that Christ made satisfaction by suffering Gods vindicative wrath, yet in this they do oppose Mr. *Norton.*

See *Ball* on the Covenant, p.190.

In the rigor of the Law (saith Mr. *Ball*) the Delinquent himself is in person to suffer the penalty denounced, *Every man shall bear his own burthen*, *Gal.*6.5. *And in the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt dye the death*, Gen.2.17. so that the Law, in the rigor

rigor thereof, doth not (saith hee) admit of any commutation or substitution of one for another; and so hee concludes, that satisfaction was made by another free Covenant.

2 The *minor* is unsound; for it affirms, that God could not dispence with the excution of the (Essential) Curse, without the violation of his Justice; But in this Tenent Mr. *Norton* doth sufficiently confute himself; for he doth often say, that Christ suffered pains equivalent to the pains of Hell: If they were but equivalent, then they were not the same, and then God did dispence with the Essential pains in kind, which is contrary to his *minor*, and contrary to his first Distinction.

1 King. 21. 3. M. *Norton* leaves the point of satisfaction in an uncertaintie, because he doth one while say that Christ suffered the essential curse, & onely that, & another while that onely which was equivalent.

Ahab offered unto *Naboth* that which was equivalent to the full worth of his Vineyard, but yet *Ahab* could not accept it for satisfaction, because God had determined in *Lev.* 25. 23. That the Land should not be sold for ever, and therefore *Naboth* could not account any equivalent thing to be satisfaction, but his Vineyard in kind onely, 1 *King.* 21. 3. So changeable are Mr. *Nortons* Principles, that they can have but little truth in them.

Reply 2. But Mr. *Norton* doth labor to confirm his *minor*, by *Matth.* 5. 18. *Till Heaven and Earth pass, one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass from the Law, till all be fulfilled.*

This Scripture Mr. *Norton* doth cite several times, 1. To prove that Christ fulfilled the Law by suffering the Essential punishment of the Curse for us, as in p. 10, 104, 213.

2 He doth also often cite it, to prove that Christ, as God-Man Mediator, fulfilled the Law in a way of works for us, as in p. 152, 192, 197, 240, 267.

Therefore, seeing he doth lay such great weight upon this Text, I think it needful to examine the true sense of this Text, and then it will appear that Mr. *Norton* doth pervert the true sense of it to his corrupt ends.

This Text of *Mat.* 5. 17, 18. doth speak of Christs fulfilling the Law; but not in respect of his own personal conformity to it (as Mr. *Norton* would have it to speak) but it speaks of his fulfilling it by filling up the spiritual sense of it, which was suppressed by the Scribes and Pharisees; he fulfilled, that is to say, he filled

Mat. 5. 17, 18.

filled up the true Interpretation of it in its latitude, for the regulating of the inward man as well as of the outward, in the way of ſanctified obedience: In this ſenſe *Matthew* ſaith, *That Chriſt came to fulfill the Law*; and in this ſenſe it did belong to his Mediators Office, as he was the Prophet of his Church, to rebuke the Scribes and Phariſees for deſtroying the ſpiritual ſenſe of the Law, by their litteral and corrupt interpretations; But ſaith Chriſt, *I came to fulfill it*, by giving the ſpiritual ſenſe and meaning of it, for the regulating of the inward man as well as of the outward, as ver. 21,27,33,38,43. do plainly ſhew; And then he concludes with an exhortation in ver. 48. *Be ye therefore perfect, as your Father which is in heaven is perfect*; namely, be perfect in Expoſition and Doctrine, for it is the perfect rule of an upright life and converſation.

In his *Diatriba* or diſcourſes on ſeveral Scriptures.

Mr. *Joſeph Mead* on *Mat.* 5. 17. ſaith thus, Think not that I am come to take away the obligation of the Rule of mans duty to God, and to his Neighbor, given firſt by *Moſes* in the Law, and afterward repeated and inculcated by the Prophets; but to fulfill them, that is, to ſupply or perfect thoſe Rules and Doctrines of juſt and unjuſt contained in them, by a more ample inetrpretation, and other improvement befitting the ſtate of the Goſpel. For ſurely, ſaith he, this muſt be the meaning of this ſpeech of our Saviour; if we be more willing (as we ſhould) to take a ſenſe from the Scripture, than to bring one to it, doth not the whole context (ſaith he) evince it? And in p. 55. he cites *Irenæus* to the ſame ſenſe (our Lord ſaith *Irenæus*) inſtead of *Thou ſhalt not commit Adultery*, commands not ſo much as to luſt; Inſtead of *Thou ſhalt not kill*, not ſo much as to be angry; Inſtead of *to tithe*, to diſtribute all we have to the poor, &c. all which, ſaith he, is not of one that diſſolves the Law, but fulfilleth and inlargeth it.

Irenæus.

Vindiciæ legis, p. 177.

Secondly, Mr. *Burges* ſaith, Although it be true, that Chriſt may be ſaid to fulfil the Law divers wayes; yet I think he ſpeaks here moſt principally for his Doctrinal fulfilling of it; for he oppoſeth teaching the Law, to breaking the Law.

And in p. 253. he ſaith thus, Chriſt is ſaid to fulfill the Law in reſpect of the Phariſees, who by their corrupt gloſſes, had evacuated it, and in p. 273. *lect.* 29. He opens *Mat.* 5. 17. 18. to his formet ſenſe.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, *Tindal* saith thus, Here hast thou, dear Reader, an Exposition of *Matth.* 5, 6, and 7. Chapters, wherein Christ our spiritual *Isaak* hath digged again the *Wells of Abraham*, which the Scribes and Pharisees had stopped and filled up with the earth of their false Expositions; he restoreth the key of knowledge. In his Prolog. & in Mat. 5. 17, 18.

And on vers. 17. he saith thus, I came not to destroy the Law, but to repair it onely, and to make it go upright where it halteth.

And presently after, I do but onely wipe away the filth and rotten glosses wherewith the Scribes and Pharisees have smeared the Law.

And saith he in vers. 21, 22. Christ beginneth not to destroy the Law, as the Pharisees had falsly accused him, but to restore it again to the right understanding, and to purge it from the glosses of the Pharisees.

And saith he in vers. 48. This Text doth not say ye shall be as perfect as God, but perfect after his example: To be perfect (saith he) is to have pure Doctrine without false Opinions, and that thy heart be to follow that learning.

Fourthly, Dr. *Barnes* answers the Popish Justiciaries thus, Our Master Christ in *Mat.* 5. doth there reprove the false interpretation which they did set to the Law, but he teacheth no new works, nor is a giver of any new Law. *Barns in Tindal* p. 229.

Fifthly, *Marlorat* on *Mat.* 5. 17, 18. saith, The Law is destroyed or broken, when it is made void and of none effect by false Expositions and traditions of men, or else by a wicked life; but here he understandeth the destroying of the Law after the first manner, namely, by false expositions, and therefore it follows, that Christ came to fulfill it by filling up the sense, for the regulating of the inward as well as of the outward man.

Sixthly, Mr. *Blake* on *Mat.* 5. 18. saith thus, Christ indeed as soon as he publickly appeared in the work of Redemption, was charged that he came to destroy the Law, but this he did utterly disavow, professing, that he *came not to destroy the Law, but to fulfil it*, and saith he (presently after) Christ asserts a necessity of a higher degree of obedience than the Scribes and Pharisees taught or practised, saying, *Except your righteousness exceed, &c.* which must be understood of righteousness inherent, in conformity to *Vindiciæ Fatoris*, p. 49. See also Dr. *Hammond's* Annot on Mat. 5. 17, 18. & in his Practical Cat. p. 104, 105. in his 5. Edition.

the Law, as it appears by the precedent words, and is more fully confirmed in the words that follow; and upon this occasion Christ openeth the Commandements of the Law, and how far we must transcend them, if ever we come to the Kingdom of Heaven.

And to this purpose doth Mr. *Ball* expound *Mat.*5.18. on the Covenant.p.114.

Seventhly, I will now conclude with *Mr. Calvin.*

Although (saith *Calvin*) Christ might worthily have boasted that he came to fulfill the Law with the perfection of his life, yet here, notwithstanding, he treateth of Doctrine, and not of his Life.

Calvin on Mat. 5.17,18.

You see that *Calvin* doth deny that Christ spake of fulfilling the Law in *Matth.*5.18. In Mr. *Norton's* sense, he treates here, saith *Calvin*, of Doctrine, and not of his life, much less of suffering the essential punishment of the curse, as Mr. *Norton* would have this Text to speak for the proof of his Assumption.

I may justly retort his own words against himself, in p.145. Let not the Reader be moved with the multitude of Scriptures which he hath mis alledged against the Dialogue: but know, the erring and private interpretation of them to be but a very fallacy, of putting that for a cause which is not a cause; namely, that which is not a divine Testimony, for a divine Testimony: The letter of the Scripture alleged not according to its sense, is not Scripture. No Hereticks or Heretofore, as such, ever cited the word of God.

His second Argument is this, in pag. 11.

Either Christ suffered the wrath of God, i. e. the punishment due to the sins of the Elect, or else God is untrue in that commination, He that sins shall die, because the Elect themselves do not suffer it.

But God is true, 1 Sam. 15.29. Tit. 1.2.

Reply. This Argument is just like the former, they are both founded on the same supposition, namely, that the essential curse of hell torment threatned in the first Covenant, must either be executed on the Elect, or on their Surety in their stead.

As

As for his proof of his Proposition. *The soul that sinneth shall die*, Ezek. 18. 20. This Text I have examined, and brought it from the Context, to speak to another sense, in chap. 6. 22. Reply 9.

As for that in *Gen.* 2. 17. I have denied it in his sense, in the former Argument.

But it had been more true, if he had framed his Argument thus.

Either the Elect suffered the spiritual death in sin, threatned on all mankind, in *Gen.* 2. 17. or else God is not true; as I have opened the sense of *Gen.* 2. 17. in Chap. 2. Sect. 3.

But God is true, &c.

His third Argument is this, in pag. 43.

He that was the Surety of the Elect, was bound to pay their debt, and consequently to satisfie the Law for them.

But Christ was the Surety of the Elect, Heb. 7. 22.

Reply. I deny the major, for I have shewed in Chap. 2. that if it were indeed true, that Christ was a Surety in the same obligation with *Adam*, to pay his debt of obedience, and to suffer the curse of his disobedience, according to the conditions of the first Covenant, Then 1. Christ must go to the land of *Eden* to eat of the tree of Life, that so he may truly perform that act of obedience for *Adam*. And 2. He must be dead in sin, that so he may suffer the curse of his disobedience, for his sinful act in eating of the tree of Knowledge of good and evill. If Mr. *Norton* will say, that these things could not be done, and suffered by Christ; thence I infer, that Christ then was not a Surety in the same obligation with *Adam*, to pay his proper debt of obedience, and to suffer his proper curse in kind.

Secondly, I deny the *minor*; namely, that Christ was such a Surety; that place cited to prove it in *Heb.* 7. 22. is miserably applied to his sense, and yet he doth often cite it to prove his sense of the word Surety; and he puts very great weight on the word Surety in his sense, and therefore he doth repeat it above twenty or thirty times, and his proof is still from *Heb.* 7. 22. as in pag. 85. 149. &c.

Therefore I will now examine the ſenſe of the word *Surety*, in *Heb.* 7. 22. and then it will appear to have a differing ſenſe from Mr. *Norton's* ſenſe.

Heb. 7. 22.

The Text ſpeaks thus,

By ſo much was Jeſus made a Surety of a better Teſtament, namely, by ſo much as Gods oath is a more infallible aſſurance of the perpetual Prieſthood of Chriſt, above the temporary Prieſthood of *Aaron* and his Sons, by ſo much is the Prieſthood of Chriſt to intercede for us more certain than theirs.

See *Ainſ.* in Lev. 8. 36.

For when the Covenant of the Prieſthood was conferred and confirmed unto the Tribe of *Levi*, in *Aaron* and his Sons *Lev.* 8, (which Covenant was life and peace, *Mal.* 2. 5. called alſo Gods Covenant of peace, *Numb.* 25. 13. for God gave the office and maintenance to the Prieſts by Covenant, *Numb.* 18. 7, 8. 1 *Sam.* 2, 27, 35.) they were made Prieſts without an oath (becauſe God would be at liberty to alter that Covenant) alſo they were many Prieſts, becauſe they were not ſuffered to continue by reaſon of death.

Theſe Prieſts ſerved unto the example and ſhadow of heavenly things, offering gifts and ſacrifices, which could not make him that did the ſervice perfect, as pertaining to the conſcience; for they were carnal Ordinances impoſed on them till the time of Reformation, that is, until the coming of Chriſt, who is now ſprung out of the Tribe of *Judah*, and was made a Prieſt of God with an oath, and a Surety of a better Teſtamental-Covenant, eſtabliſhed upon better promiſes; and becauſe he continueth for ever, he hath a Prieſthood that paſſeth not from him to another.

Secondly, Dr. *Hammon* doth thus paraphraſe upon *Heb.* 7. 20, 21, 22.

God ſware, and will not repent, which (ſaith he) is an argument of the immutability and weightineſs of the matter, and of the eternal continuance of this Prieſthood of Chriſt, and ſo of the preheminence of it beyond the *Aaronical*, which was not eſtabliſhed by God with an Oath; and ſo much as a durable, immutable, and eternal Prieſthood, is better than a tranſitory, mutable, and final Prieſthood (ſuch as the Levitical, being fixt in mortal perſons, one ſucceeding the other, and as was it ſelf mortal, not to laſt any longer than till the coming of Chriſt) ſo much better

better was that Covenant, wherein Christ was Sponsor and Surety for God, that it should be made good to us on Gods part, confirmed to us by Christ in the Gospel; a better Covenant than that of the Law, wherein *Moses* undertook for God to us.

This Scripture thus expounded, is so far from confirming Mr. *Nortons* sense of the word *Surety*, that it utterly over-turnes it.

For this Exposition makes Christ to be Gods Priest, and Gods Surety to us; but Mr. *Norton* makes this Surety to be our Surety to God in the same obligation with *Adam* to the first Covenant.

The Priests in the Law were ordained by God, to make attonement for the people for their ceremonial sins, by sprinkling the blood of their sacrifices on the Altar for their attonement; but Christ was ordained by an oath first made to *David*, *Psa.* 110. That *he would raise a Priest out of his loyns after the order of* Melchisedech, and that by his own blood he should make attonement, to assure their conscience of the pardon of all their moral sins; and so he should be Gods Surety of a better Testamental-Covenant, as Mr. *Ainsworth* translates it, for the greek signifies both a Covenant and a Testament.

It is called a Covenant (saith Mr. *Ball*) in respect of the manner of agreement, and a Testament, in respect of the manner of confirming; a Covenant in respect of God, a Testament in respect of Christ, who dyed as a Testator, and confirmed by his death the testamentary promise made before (of God) for the obtaining of the eternal inheritance by the remission of sins. *Ball* on the Coven. p. 196

Hence I conclude, that this word *Surety*, in *Heb.* 7. 22. cannot be understood of Gods making Christ to be our Surety in the same obligation with *Adam* to the first Covenant.

Secondly, For his proof of the consequence of his Argument by *Rom.* 3. 31. I refer the Reader to my Reply to his eighth Argument.

Thirdly, He confirms his Argument by this Reason.

We are to know (saith he) *that the Covenant of Grace it self obligeth us to fulfill the Covenant of Works in our Surety.*

Thirdly, I grant that the Covenant of Grace doth oblige us

to observe the moral Law as a Rule of our sanctified walking, as I have shewed at large in my exposition of *Lam.* 3. 3. in chap. 2. sect. 2. But the Covenant of Grace doth not oblige us to fulfill the first Covenant of Works given to *Adam*, for the Covenant was about things indifferent in their own nature, and it was but temporary, to last no longer than till the trial of *Adam's* obedience or disobedience was made by one act, as I have shewed in Chap. 2.

De Recon. pec. p. 2. l. 1. c. 3. n. 4. & c. 5. n. 7.

2 In case the first Covenant had been made in relation to the moral Law of Nature, yet in that sense Mr. *Norton* doth answer such an Argument as this, gathered from *Illyricus* and *Heminginus*, drawn from *Rom.* 3. 31. and I believe a judicious Reader will find more satisfaction in his reasoning, than in Mr. *Nortons*.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in pag. 18.

The word Better is not to be referred to either Covenant it self, but to the manner of the dispensation of the Covenant of Grace under the Gospel.

Reply. It is evident that the word *Better* is to be referred to the Covenant of Grace, which is better than the outward, legal, ceremonial Covenant: But it seems to me that Mr. *Norton* doth not understand the Apostles comparative Argument, how Christ was made a *Surety of a better Covenant*; but for the Readers information, I will open my understanding of the word *better Covenant*.

First, Consider that God made two Covenants with his people *Israel* at Mount *Sinai*. First, An outward, typical Covenant. Secondly, an inward, spiritual Covenant; namely, a Covenant of Works, and a Covenant of Grace, and both these are comprehended in the ten Commandements.

The Ceremonial outward worship is called the first Covenant, and to it did belong *Dicaiomata*, Ordinances of Divine Service, *Heb.* 9. 1. which in Ver. 10. are called carnal Ordinances, or Decrees, as Mr. *Ainsworth* expresseth it in *Psal.* 119. Some translate *Dicaiomata*, Justifications (as I noted before on *Gal.* 4. 4.) And in *Dan.* 8. 14. when the Temple was ceremonially cleansed, it is said

said to be *Tsadak*, justified; and so likewise all such as were legally cleansed, were justified as to their personal appearing in Gods Sanctuary; but Mr. *Ainsworth* doth translate it *just Ordinances*, or *Righteous Statutes*, in *Numb.* 31.21. The same word, saith he, *Paul* useth, in *Rom.* 2.26. *If the uncircumcision keep the Ordinances, or righteous Statutes of the Law* (namely, in the spiritual signification) and in *Rom.* 8.4. *That the Ordinance or righteous Statute of the Law might be fulfilled in us*; And so in *Deut.* 4.1. the word Ordinances doth there denote the ceremonial Ordinances, as Circumcision, the Tabernacle, and all the other outward services of the Sanctuary, these are called the first Covenant, in *Heb.* 9.1 and the outward performances of these Services (though they wanted faith to make a spiritual application) did *ex opere operato* justifie their persons in respect of their coming into Gods presence in his Sanctuary; but this first Covenant was ordained but for their present Tutorship, and therefore at the coming of Christ they are said to *wax old and to be ready to vanish away*, *Heb.* 8.13.

Note that Ro. 8.4. is no proof that Christ kept the moral Law for our righteousnes by Gods imputation, because it alludes to the Ordinances of the Ceremonial Law, as *Ainf.* & the Dialogue do carry it.

And by three things all *Israel* did enter first into this Covenant of Works. 1. By Circumcision, *Exod.* 12.48. 2. By Baptism, *Exod.* 19.10. 3. By Sacrifice, *Exod.* 24.5. See *Ainf.* in *Gen.* 17.12.

This first Covenant was confirmed with the blood of Beasts, to assure them, that if they did carefully observe the Ordinances of it, they should be justified and cleansed from their ceremonial sins, and then they might be freely come unto Gods presence in his Sanctuary, or else they might not, under the penalty of being cut off, as I noted before on *Gal.* 4.4.

The Ordinances of this Covenant were written in a Book which is called the book of the Covenant, 2 *King.* 23.2. *Deut.* 24.7. See *Ainf.* in *Psa.* 25.10.

But this Covenant of Works did not disanull the Covenant of Grace that was confirmed (430 years) afore of God, in respect of Christ, *Gal.* 3.17.

This Covenant was also confirmed by the blood and death of beasts, *Heb.* 9.18,19. and the people entred into an oath and a curse if they kept not this Covenant, *Deut.* 29.12. *Nehem.* 10.29. *And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, behold the blood of the Covenant that Jehovah hath stricken with you, concerning all these words*, Exod. 24.7,8. and thus the first Covenant or Testament

ment was not dedicated without blood, *Heb.*9.18,23. and this ſprinkling of blood was done with ſcarlet-wool and Hyſop, *Heb.* 9.19,20. according to the manner preſcribed in the Law, *Lev.* 14.6,7.

But all theſe ceremonial cleanſings, though they were effectual by Gods Ordinance, *ex opere operato*, to juſtifie the outward man, for their coming into Gods preſence in his Sanctuary; yet without Faith in Chriſt they had no power to cleanſe the Conſcience from their moral ſins; and therefore as ſoon as *Paul* was brought home to Chriſt, he renounced all his former righteouſneſs of the Law, wherein he formerly truſted, *Phil.*3.9. And, ſaith the Apoſtle, *If the blood of Buls and Goats, and the aſhes of an Heifer ſprinkling the unclean, ſanctifieth to the purifying of the fleſh*; and if the blood of Birds, and water, and hyſop, and ſcarlet, ſprinkling the unclean, ſanctifieth to the purifying of the fleſh; *How much more* (ſaith the Apoſtle) *ſhall the blood of Chriſt purge the Conſcience from dead works?* *Heb.* 9.13,14. *Levit.*14.7. *Pſal.*51.9. *Numb.* 8.7. *Levit.*14.8. *Levit.* 15.5,18. & 13.22. with *Heb.*10. 22.

Theſe ceremonial Laws did not command that which was good, nor forbid that which was evil in it ſelf, and therefore ſaith *Weems* in his ſecond volume p. 4. the ceremonial Laws are called Statutes that were not good, *Ezek.*20.25.

Now the Prieſts that did mediate between God and his people, for the forgiveneſs of their ceremonial ſins by the blood of beaſts, were made Prieſts after the Law of a carnal Commandement, and therefore their office muſt be diſanulled for the weakneſs and unprofitableneſs of it, and therefore thoſe Prieſts were made without an Oath, becauſe they ſhould be changed; but Chriſt was made a Prieſt by an oath, after the order of *Melchiſedech*, *And by ſo much was Jeſus made a Surety of a better Teſtament*, becauſe God by his oath made him a Surety, and an unchangeable Prieſt for our Moral Reconciliation, according to the promiſes of the *better Teſtament*.

And thus have I opened the word *Better Covenant*. Mr. *Norton* makes the firſt Covenant with *Adam* to be the old Covenant, but that is not ſuitable to the Apoſtles Argument; and therefore I make the Ceremonial Covenant at Mount *Sinai* to be the firſt Covenant in the Apoſtles ſenſe in this place, and to be old, and to be done

done away by the Mediator of the better new Testament by his death, *Heb.*9.15.

His Fourth Argument examined, is this, in p. 12.

Either Christ suffered the punishment due to the Elect for sin, or the Law remaineth for ever unsatisfied; for it is as true as Salvation it self, that the Elect satisfie it not in themselves.

Reply 1. It is as true as Salvation it self, that all the Elect do in themselves suffer that dreadful death in sin that was denounced to mans nature in general, in case *Adam* as their head in the first Covenant did eat of the tree of Knowledge of good and evil; and that death is the essential curse that is there threatned, as I have shewed in chap. 2. sect. 3.

2. In that the Elect do escape eternal death, which God ordained afterwards as a consequent of that death threatned in *Gen.*2.17. it is from Christs satisfaction. It is not required by the Rules of Equity, whether Divine or Humane, that satisfaction for wrongs done should alwaies be made in kind, or by way of counter-passion; as for example, in case a man in his rage should beat his Neighbor, or butcher his Cattel, were it as good and as just satisfaction for the supreme Magistrate to commend the party wronged to exercise the like rage and cruelty on his person, or his goods, as it is to award him satisfaction by a valuable sum of mony, or the like? But it is evident, that the Law may be satisfied two wayes, 1. Either according to the exact letter of the Law, which requires Eye for Eye, Tooth for Tooth, *Exod.*21.24. and so for him that steales one Ox, five Oxen in kind, *Exod.*22.1. Or 2. The Law may be satisfied by suffering or by paying that which is equivalent to the damage of the Eye lost: And so in case a poor man steal an Ox, and not able to pay five Oxen for one, yet if his rich friend will pay that which the owner shall accept for five Oxen, the Law in the true intent of it is satisfied; and so the first-born of man and of beast was redeemed with mony, *Numb.*18.15,16. In like sort I find this sentence in the learned, that that is to be held for satisfaction which was mutually agreed on between the Father and the Mediator from Eternity, and to this very purpose doth Mr.

The Law is satisfied either by payment in kind, or by that which is equivalent.

Exod. 21. 24.

Gataker cite that Proverb, *Money is recompenced by the free*; and thus Christ made satisfaction for the Elect; and this is acknowledged even by such as hold that Christ made satisfaction by suffering the wrath of God. There is a twofold payment of debt, saith Mr. *Ball*, one of the things altogether the same in the obligation; and this, *ipso facto*, freeth from punishment, whether it be paid by the Debtor himself, or by the Surety. Another of a thing which is not altogether the same in the obligation, so that some act of the Creditor or Governor must come unto it, which is called Remission; in which case deliverance doth not follow *ipso facto* upon the satisfaction; and of this kind, saith he, is the satisfaction of Christ.

Now if Mr. *Norton's* meaning be, that except Christ did satisfie the punishment due to the Elect in kind, the Law doth for ever remain unsatisfied, then I deny the *major*; for the Law may be satisfied, though Christ did never suffer the Curse in kind.

1 It cannot be in kind, according to the first Covenant made with *Adam*, as I have shewed often.

2 It is evident, that it was from another Covenant made between the Trinity, according to the Council of their own will, which Covenant was revealed to *Adam* presently after the fall, as I have opened it in some measure.

Upon Genesis p. 35. Heb. 10. 10.

Mr. *Gataker* in his *Elenchus Animad.* gives this exposition of *Heb.* 10. 10. *I come to do thy will*, by which Will we are sanctified, through the oblation of his body, &c.

That Will (saith he) is the Stipulation (or Covenant) of the Father, about Christs undertaking our cause upon himself, and performing those things that are requisite for the expiation of our sins; therefore it comprehends all the obedience of Christ, which he performed to the peculiar Law of Mediation; for this Law set apart, he was not bound (saith he) by any other Law, to the oblation of himself.

Christ did not make satisfaction by fulfilling the first Covenant, but by fulfilling another voluntary Covenant that was made between the Trinity.

Hence it follows, that if Christ made satisfaction by another voluntary Covenant between the Trinity, then not by the first supreme Covenant, made with *Adam*. And to this very purpose also doth Mr. *Ball* and Mr. *Baxter* speak, as I have noted in Chap. 3. Sect. 3.

His fifth Argument examined, which is this.

If the Gospel save without satisfaction given to the Law; then the Law is made void by the Gospel, and the Law and the Promises are contrary.

But neither of these are so, Rom. 3. 31. Gal. 3. 21.

Therefore, &c.

Reply, If by satisfaction Mr. *Norton* mean such a satisfaction as he hath formerly laid down, namely, by suffering the essential torments of Hell in kind; Then I deny the consequence: For first, The Gospel doth save without satisfaction in kind; And Secondly, without any prejudice to the Law, as I have shewed in my Reply to the former Argument, and shall reply further to *Rom.* 3. 31. at the Examination of his eighth Argument.

His Sixt Argument examined, which is this.

If Christ suffered not the punishment due to the Elect; then the Elect must suffer it in their own persons.

Reply, Neither of these is necessary; for the Gospel doth tell us of another price paid, and so consequently of satisfaction by that price (and therefore not by suffering hell torments in kind) as in *Isa.* 53. 10. *When he shall make,* or *set, his soul a trespass,* i. e. a Trespass offering, as *Ephes.* 5. 2. *Mat.* 20. 28. and by his soul must be understood, his vital soul, as I have expounded it in Chap. 7. Sect. 3. p. 68.

His seventh Argument examined, which is this.

If Christ did not suffer the punishment due to the Elect for sin; then there can be no justification of a sinner, without his suffering the punishment due to sin, i. e. his passive obedience; There is no reason to acknowledge his active obedience (whence we are accepted as righteous) this being in vain without that; if there be neither passive obedience, nor active, then there is no remission of sins, nor

acceptation as Righteous, and consequently no justification.

Reply. The consequence of this Argument is built upon a very weak foundation, neither do the reasons annexed sufficiently strengthen it.

First (saith he) If Christ did not suffer the punishment due to the Elect for sin, then there can be no remission.

This is but humane language, the Scripture doth not say so; but that which the Scripture saith, is this, namely, That without shedding of blood there is no remission of sin, *Heb.*9.22. God told the result of the eternal Decree to *Adam*, that the Devil must persecute Christ, and shed his blood by peircing him in the foot-soal, and yet that the Seed of the Woman at the self-same time should break the Devils Head-plot, by continuing obedient to the death through all his temptations and trials; and then having finished all that was written of him, he should set his soul a Trespass-offering, which he did, when he said, *Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit*; and at that time he bowed his head, and gave up the ghost by his own Priestly Power, and not by Sathans power.

Heb. 9.22.
Esa. 53.10.
Gen. 3.15.
Phi. 2.8.

And without this combate with Sathan, and without this shedding of blood, there is no Satisfaction, and so no Remission.

But this Death and Sacrifice of Christ might be, and was, without any suffering from the immediate wrath of God.

Though not without Gods appointment and permission to Sathan to do his utmost against this Seed of the Woman, to spoil his obedience if he could, in which conflict Christ had his Foot-soal pierced, but the Devil had his Head-plot broken, *Gen.* 3.15. because he could not provoke Christ to any impatience, or turning away back till he had spoyled the Head-plot of Principalities and Powers by his obedient death on the Crosse.

Col. 2.14,15.

The Apostle doth tell us, that we have Remission of sins by vertue of Christs satisfaction, namely, by his bloody death and sacrifice, *Heb.*9.15,26,28. *Heb.*10.10,14. without any mention of his suffering of the essential torments of Hell, in all the Scripture, though the blessed Scriptures are often perverted by Mr. *Norton* to that sense.

The

This rest that follows is built but upon this sandy foundation, and therefore it will fall of it self.

His eight Argument examined, which is this:

If justifying faith establish the Law, then Christ the object of faith, hath established, that is, fulfilled the Law, for otherwise the Law cannot be established by faith.

But justifying faith hath established the Law, Rom. 3.31. *Therefore Christ the object of faith, hath fulfilled the Law.*

Reply. 1. If by this conclusion, Christ the object of faith, hath fulfilled the Law, he means no more but this, namely, that Christ fulfilled the Law in the Preceptive part of it, then hee proves no more than the Dialogue, and all good Christians do grant.

But if he mean that Christ fulfilled the vindicative part of the Law, by suffering the punishment of the eternal Curse, which doubtlesse is the great thing that he aims at, then any ordinary Reader, may easily see that his Argument doth not conclude so much.

This Argument therefore makes nothing to the point in hand, except it be to fill up the number of Eight.

But yet I will examine the premises of his Syllogism.

1 I except against the consequence of his first Proposition; for though the Text doth expressely say, That justifying faith doth establish the Law, yet it doth not thence follow, That Christ the object of faith hath fulfilled it in his sense.

2 Else the Law cannot be established by faith; this also is another Paradox, for many Orthodox Divines do shew how the Law may be established in other respects. Rom. 3.31.

Reply. 2. I say, that Mr. *Nortons* exposition of establishing the Law in *Rom.* 3.31. is nothing neer the Apostles meaning.

What though *Beza* and *Parem* go that way that Mr. *Norton* doth; yet Dr. *Willet* (whom Mr. *Norton* doth often much approve) doth reject their exposition, and that upon this ground; because the Apostle speaks there of fulfilling the Law, by the members of Christ, and not by Christ the Head alone. And

Beza in his ſhort notes doth expound it as Dr. *Willet* doth, [*wee*] ſaith he, make it firm and effectual.

But *Calvin* renders the text thus [*It is*] eſtabliſhed and confirmed: And ſo ſpeaks *Piſcator* in his Moral Obſervations on that text, refuting the Antinomians.

In Vindicia legis lect. 21. p. 109.

Mr. *Burges* ſaith, It is a Metaphor borrowed from corroborating or ſtrengthning a pillar that is ready to fall.

Peter Martyr accords with *Calvin* and *Piſcator*, namely, that to eſtabliſh is to confirm, in oppoſition to abrogate or diſannull.

And truly, ſeeing the latter part of the verſe doth run in oppoſition to the former; it follows, that to eſtabliſh the Law, muſt not be expounded to fulfill the Law, as Mr. *Norton* doth carry it, for ſaith hee, Chriſt the object of faith hath fulfilled the Law.

But becauſe four of Mr. *Nortons* eight Arguments are grounded on his expoſition of this Text, and alſo becauſe he makes this Text to be one of his great proofs of Hereſie againſt the Dialogue, Therefore I will labour to ſhew the Reader what the Spirit of God ſpeaks in it.

1 I intreat the Judicious Reader to take notice, That the Queſtion betwixt us, is not, whether faith doth eſtabliſh the Law, or no, for the Text it ſelf doth affirm it.

But the point in difference is, In what ſenſe doth faith eſtabliſh the Law: Mr. *Norton* ſaith, That Chriſt doth eſtabliſh the Law by ſuffering the eſſential curſe of Hell-torments. But in that ſenſe I deny it.

Neither will I tire out the Reader by relating the various apprehenſions of the Learned, but pitch upon ſuch as I beleeve are ſoundeſt.

1 Take notice, that *Peter Martyr* on this place doth copiouſly ſhew how the Law is eſtabliſhed, ſeveral wayes, and yet he hath not a word in any of his expoſitions that Chriſt ſuffered the eſſential curſe of the Law; he comes nothing neer to Mr. *Nortons* ſenſe.

2 *Aretius* ſhews, how the Law is eſtabliſhed three wayes by faith, and yet he hath not a word of eſtabliſhing it by Chriſts ſuffering of the eſſential curſe.

3 Mr. *Wotton* in his Anſwer to an Argument taken from this

this Text by *Heningius*, shewe, that the Apostle speaks of establishing the Law as it is a Rule of Justice, which is in very deed the proper end of the Law; and for this sense, hee produceth the Testimony of *Augustine*, *Anselm*, and *Primasius*. *De Recons. peccatoris, part. 2. l. 1. c. 5. n. 7. p. 120, &c.*

4 Mr. *Barges* brings in three opinions of the Orthodox, who shew how the Law is established by faith; But he rejects Mr. *Nortons* way of establishing (as Dr. *Willet* did) and concludes with the judgement of *Austine*, that the Law is established, because by the Gospel we obtain grace in some measure to fulfill the Law; and in this he agrees with Mr. *Wotton*; and his second Doctrine upon this Text is this, That the Doctrine of Christ and grace in the highest and fullest manner doth not overthrow but establish the Law. *In Vindiciæ legis lect. 21. n. 1 in p. 120, 121.*

5 Mr. *Blake* saith thus, *Paul* foreseeing that this very thing would be charged upon him, as it was upon Christ (namely, that he came to destroy the Law, *Mat.* 5. 17, 18.) saith, *Do we make void the Law through faith? yea we establish the Law*, Rom. 3. 31. our Doctrine is a confirmation, and no abolition of it; and in other words he proceeds to shew, that faith doth establish the Law as it is the Rule of sanctified walking. *In vindiciæ Fœderis p. 50.*

6 Saith Mr. *Ball*, The Apostle doth not perpetually and absolutely oppose the Law and the Covenant of grace; for he teacheth expresly, that Faith establisheth the Law, *Rom.* 3. 31. for (saith he) the Apostle understood the force and sentence of the Law to consist in Faith; But because the Jews, addicted to the letter of the Law, did pretermit the force and life of it, *Paul* proves that the Law so taken and separated from Faith, to be the cause, not of life, but of death, &c. *Ball on the Coven. p. 115.*

7 *Tindal* saith, Faith onely justifieth, maketh righteous, and fulfilleth the Law; for it bringeth the Spirit through Christs deservings, The Spirit bringeth lust, looseth the heart, maketh him free, and giveth him strength to work the deeds of the Law with love, even as the Law requireth; then at last, out of the same Faith springeth all good works of their own accord, and that meaneth he in *Rom.* 3. 31. for after he had cast away the works of the Law, his speech sounded as though he would break and disanul the Law through Faith; But to that he answereth, We destroy not the Law through Faith, but maintain, further, and stablish the Law, that is to say, we fulfill the Law through *In Tindals works fol. 41.*

through Faith, *Rom.* 3. 31. and this Exposition he gives also in fol. 46. and in other places.

8 Dr. *Barns* doth thus dispute with the Popish Bishops. Then (saith he) came your overthwart Fathers and said to *Paul*, thou destroyest the Law, and teachest that it justifieth not: God forbid (saith *Paul*) we teach that the very way to fulfil the Law is Faith, and without which all the works of the Law be but sin.

Dr. *Barns* principled with *Tindals* works. fol. 238.

I could adde more Orthodox writers to this sense, but because these that I have cited are no Babes in Divinity, therefore I beleeve they will satisfie the judicious Reader, of the true sense, and that Mr. *Nortons* Exposition is a forced and erroneous Exposition.

From all the premises therefore, I may well conclude, That Mr. *Norton* hath not, nor cannot infer a concluding Argument from *Rom.* 3. 31. to prove that Christ fulfilled the Law by suffering the essentiall punishments of the curse; and therefore his ground-work of censuring the Dialogue of Heresie from this text, may justly be returned upon his own head. And now let the Judicious Reader judge betwixt us.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

His Answer to the point of Christs satisfaction, as it is stated in the Dialogue, Examined.

The sum of his Answer is drawn up into this Argument, in p. 17. and it may be called his ninth Argument.

Such meritorious Mediatorly obedience, as indebteth God in point of justice to remit the just punishment of sin, without any violation of justice; nay, with the establishment of justice, must needs be done in such a way of satisfaction unto justice, as includes a suffering of justice.

But the meritorious Mediatorly obedience of Christ is such a meritorious mediatorly obedience, whereby God is indebted in point of justice to remit the just punishment of sin, 1 Joh. 1. 9. *without the violation of Justice,* Rom. 3. 26. *Yea, with the establishing of Justice.*

Therefore the meritorious Mediatorly obedience of Christ was performed in such a way of satisfaction unto Justice, as includes also a suffering of Justice.

Reply IF I had met with this Argument in another Book, wherein I had not been concerned, I should have thought it but a silly Argument, for neither the major, minor, nor Conclusion, are without their fault.

1. The Conclusion is faulty, because it comes not up in *terminis* to what should be concluded and proved.

For the point of difference, as it is stated by Mr. *Norton* but five lines before this Syllogism, speaks thus, *We know, that we affirm and defend, that Christ suffered the wrath of God, and that in a way of satisfaction unto divine Justice.* But in this Conclusion of his Syllogism, there is never a word of Christs suffering the wrath of God. But had he made his Conclusion so,

the Scriptures cited in the *minor* will not bear up such a Conclusion, 2 His *major* is unsound; for God may be indebted by the meritorious mediatorly obedience of Christ, in point of justice, to remit the just punishment of sin, without any violation of Justice, nay, with the establishing of Justice, and yet there is no necessity it should be done in such a way of satisfaction unto Justice, as includes such a suffering of Justice, as must be executed upon him from the vindicative wrath of God, as he affirms from *Gen.* 2.17. And the reason is so plain, that he that runs may read it: Namely, because the ground of satisfaction to Justice ariseth not from the sufferings themselves, as they were threatned to the sinner for his disobedience to the first Covenant, but from the conditions of the voluntary Covenant, wherein all the Trinity were equally Covenanters, and all the Articles of that Covenant were positive Laws, unto which as a voluntary Mediator he yeelded obedience, as I have shewed in chap. 2.

The ground of satisfaction to Gods Justice ariseth from the conditions of the voluntary Covenant,

The Father propounded his Terms to the second person, and the second person covenanted to do what he thought fit to accept and perform, and the performance of that was accepted by the Father, as fully satisfactory to his justice, as payment in kind could have been.

He that doth voluntarily undertake to perform a combate with his opposite Champion, in order to the voluntary Laws and Covenants that were made for the triall of Masteries; if he did strive and overcome his opposite Champion, according to those Laws, did merit the prize, by vertue of that free Covenant, and free performance; suppose it were for the redemption of Captives that he had deserved death; Justice according to Covenant was as fully satisfied by this performance, as if the Delinquent, or the voluntary Surety in his place, had suffered full punishment in kind.

Obedience performed to the Articles of a voluntary Covenant doth merit the prize.

Again take another instance of a voluntary Covenant; a Pepper corn paid by a Tenant to his Landlord, according to the conditions of a voluntary Covenant, is current pay and satisfaction also, though not under the notion of a valuable consideration, yet under the notion of a voluntary bargain and Covenant, mutually agreed to by both parties.

These instances shew that the ground of satisfaction to justice may arise as well from the voluntary cause as from the order

order of natural cause. I hope none is so weak as to think, that by this last instance, I value Christs satisfaction to a pepper corn, for his death and sacrifice was of infinite value in it self, because it proceeded from his person that was infinite: But it was therefore satisfactory, because it was made satisfactory by the conditions of a voluntary Covenant; and indeed, nothing of the greatest value can be called a satisfactory price, until it be mutually agreed on between the person offended, and the person offering to make satisfaction.

Ahab was a person of dignity, and he offered a valuable consideration to *Naboth* for his Vineyard; for he offered as much for it as it was worth, or as good a Vineyard in the place of it; but neither this eminent person, nor this valuable consideration, could be a sufficient price to purchase *Naboth*'s Vineyard? because *Naboth* did not, nor by the Law could not consent to make it a price, as I have shewed in Chap. 8. Sect. 1. Even so, had not the Father Covenanted to accept of the person, and of the death, and sacrifice of Christ for our redemption, it had not been a price; but because God did voluntarily Covenant to accept it, therefore it is now the onely full price of satisfaction to Gods Justice. 1 King. 21.

But it seems the difference lies in the conditions of the Covenant, for Mr. *Norton* holds that Christ Covenanted to do according to the will of his Father, and that his Father willed he should obey the Law of Works, and suffer the Essential punishment of the Curse, for the exact fulfilling of the first Covenant, as our Surety (as his first Proposition speaks;) and hence he makes all Christs sufferings to be inflicted upon him from Gods vindicative Justice, as from the supreme Law-giver and Judge; because Christ was our Surety, and so a sinner by Gods imputation, and so he makes the Rule of Gods proceedings in justice against Christ, to be legal, according to the natural order of Courts of Justice against Delinquents, and therefore he makes all Christs obedience, both in his incarnation, life, and death, to be all legal, and to be all grounded on the moral Law. The difference in stating the voluntary Covenant, betwixt Mr. *Norton* and my self.

But in Cap. 2. I have shewed not only sufficient Reasons, but also the concurrence of eminent Orthodox Divines, that I believe will sufficiently satisfie a judicious Reader, that the whole order of Christs satisfaction is from the voluntary cause, and from other

conditions in the voluntary cause, and that the voluntary cause is never over-ruled by a supreme compulsory power, as I have here and there expressed in sundry parts of my Reply. It is true, saith a learned Divine, That Christ merited, as well as satisfied for us; but (saith he) that by which he merited was not his never sinning, or perfect obedience (for that was due to the Law under which he was born) but his free and voluntary giving up himself to death, without any obligation to that duty lying upon him, as man, so to do, according to that of *Heb.* 10. 7. and *Phil.* 2. 6. *Being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto the death, even the death of the Cross*; which (obedience) is there set as the foundation of his merit (wherefore God hath highly exalted him.) But all this you see is quite another matter from his active obedience, or fulfilling the Law, as being so imputed to us: But touching the difference of his mediatorial obedience, from his humane legal obedience, See more in chap. 3.

I have also, I think, sufficiently shewed, that nothing (though never so excellent in it self) can be called a price, till it be made a price by a mutual covenant and contract, and therefore when the blood & death of Christ is called the price of our redemption, *even before the foundation of the World*, 1 *Pet.* 1. 19, 20. it is a sure and certain proof to our conscience, that it was formally made to be the ful price of our redemption by a mutual Covenant and Contract between the Trinity before ever the foundation of the world was laid.

3. His *Minor* is also faulty, as it is to be understood in his sense, but let others of a differing judgement, take this sentence of his [*in point of Justice*] in their sense, and then such persons will not stumble at the *minor*. But take it as Mr. *Nortes* doth expound the Justice of the first Covenant, in *Gen.* 2. 17. and then the *minor* must be denied, and the Scriptures produced by him to prove it, must be shewed to be corruptly cited. And therefore for the better clearing of the truth, I will search into the clear sense of those Scriptures.

First, That of *Rom.* 3. 21. hath already been tried in the ballance of the Sanctuary, and found too light in his sense, in the eighth Argument of the former Chapter.

Second-

Secondly, As for that in 1 Joh. 1. 9. *If we confesse our sins, he is just to forgive us our sins.* 1 Joh. 1. 9.

Reply 1. No man will deny that God is just in forgiving sins to such as do truly confess them, because the Text *in terminis* doth affirm it. But the great matter of the dispute is, in what sense is God said to be just in forgiving sins to such as do confess them.

Mr. *Norton* saith, *That God is just in forgiving, because he had the satisfaction from Christ by suffering the same Essential torments of Hell that were threatned to Adam in the word* Death, *in* Gen. 2. 17.

But I have made a sufficient Reply to this in Chap. 4. Sect. 7. Reply 5. namely, that full satisfaction in kind, and free forgiveness, cannot possibly stand together, because they are contrary to each other.

But because the blessed Trinity, in their voluntary Covenant, did agree that such a performance by Christ should be accepted of God for the procuring of his Attonement or Reconciliation to such sinners, the Holy Ghost for Christs satisfaction sake did undertake to unite to Christ by faith (as the conditional promises in the New Covenant do testifie) Therefore God cannot but shew himself to be just according to his said Covenant with Christ, by forgiving the sins of such sinners, and so cleansing them from all unrighteousness.

And thus God is just, both according to his Covenant with Christ, and also according to his new Covenant to beleeving sinners, revealed to them from his Covenant with Christ.

And this was clearly typified in the Law, by the practice of confession of sin, and by laying their hand on the head of the sin-offerings for the procuring of their Attonements, in *Lev.* 1. 4. and 4. 29. &c. as I have rightly explained the matter in the Dialogue, p. 32, 33, 35, 36, and 155, and in this Reply also in Chap. 13.

So then the ground of Gods Justice whereby he hath made himself a Debtor to forgive the sins of beleevers, is his voluntary Covenant with Christ, namely, that upon his undertaking to perform the Combate with Satan, without any disobedience to

the Laws of the Combate, and at last to make his soul a Sacrifice, then he would be reconciled, and forgive the sins of such sinners as did beleeve their Attonement thus procured through Christs death and sacrifice, as I have formerly hinted it in my *Reply* to his fourth Proposition in Chap. 2.

And this forgivenesse (both as it relates to his Covenant with Christ, and to his new Covenant with the Elect) is called Gods Righteousnesse in *Rom.* 3. and in 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. for God must needs be as just and righteous when he performs his Covenant of Forgivenesse made first to Christ in reference to his satisfaction, and so made also to all the members of his new Covenant, As when he doth execute his vindicative threatnings upon the impenitent; and therefore such poor humble sinners may by faith call upon God to make them partakers of his Righteousnesse, namely of his gracious forgivenesse.

This Exposition, How God is just, hath a more firm foundation in this Text of 1 *Joh.* 1. 9. than Mr. *Nortons* Exposition hath.

The Examination of *Rom.* 3. 26.

Rom. 3 26. *To declare at this time his Righteousnesse (or his Justice) That he might be just, and the Justifier of him which beleeveth in Jesus.*

This Text Mr. *Norton* doth put both in the Frontispiece, and also in the conclusion of his book, and he doth repeat it sundry other times also in his book, as the mirror of his Tenent, as in page 4. 17. 40. 55. 213. 246. &c. and hee thinks that the very words of the Text do plainly confirm his sense, because he hath bestowed but little paine in his Exposition.

Mr. *Norton* makes God to be just in this Text, because he exacted such a full satisfaction from Christ our Surety materially as he hath threatned to sinners in the moral Law, and therefore he makes the Incarnation and the Death of Christ, and all his sufferings, to be in obedience to the moral Law, which hee calls the inviolable rule of Gods Relative Justice.

Reply. I on the contrary do therefore make God to be called Just in this Text, because he declared his Righteousnesse in for-

forgiving beleeving sinners for the satisfaction sake of Christ, which he performed according to the voluntary positive Law and Covenant, as it was determined in Gods secret will, and revealed only in his voluntary positive Laws (and not in his moral Law) for his positive Laws do often differ, yea they are often contrary to his moral Law. And in my *Reply* to his fifth and sixth Propositions in Chap. 2. and elsewhere, I have shewed, that Gods secret will declared only in his positive Laws (and not in his moral Law) is the inviolable Rule of his Relative Justice.

2 It is acknowledged by many judicious, that there passed a voluntary Covenant between the Trinity from Eternity, for mans Redemption, and that God did first declare this counsel of his Will in *Gen.* 3. 15. namely, that he would put an utter enmity between the Devil in the Serpent, and the seed of the deceived Woman, and that the Devil should have ful liberty to deceive this seed of the woman, and to pervert his obedience, if he could, by fraud, as he had done *Adam*, or by force, in putting him to an ignominious violent death on the Crosse by piercing him in the Foot-soals; but God declared also, that this seed of the Woman should not be deceived, but that he should break the Devils Head-plot by continuing constant in his obedience to the death, and that he should make his soul a sacrifice in the midst of his Tortures on the Crosse, which doubtlesse was exemplified to *Adam* by the death and sacrifice of a Lamb (as I have shewed elsewhere) as full satisfaction to Gods Justice, and as the procuring cause of Gods Reconciliation to all that should beleeve in this Promised seed; for what else can bee called full satisfaction, but that only that is so made by the voluntary Covenant? for the half shekels in *Exod.* 30. 12. was called the price of the Redemption of their lives; but any man may see by *Psal.* 49. 8. that materially it was not a full price, until it was made to bee the full price formally only by Gods voluntary positive Law and Covenant. Of this see more in Chap. 14. Sect. 2. *Reply* 8.

Gen. 3. 15.

The ground of full and just satisfaction to Gods justice is not by paying our full debt materially, but formally, that God doth accept for full and just satisfaction, which was constituted so to be by the conditions of the voluntary Covenant.

3 The performance of the said Combate and Sacrifice on Christs part is in Scripture phrase, called, *The Righteousnesse of Christ*, and the meritorious nature of it was to bind God the Father to perform his Covenant on his part, which was, that

he

he should be attoned and reconciled to beleeving sinners, by forgiving their sins, and receiving them into favour, and the performance of this on God the Fathers part is often in Scripture-phrase called the Righteousnesse of God (as I have shewed in 2 *Cor.* 5. 21.) *That he might be just, and the Justifier of him which beleeveth in Jesus.*

But for the better understanding of this 26. verse, I will propound, and answer these two Queries.

1 How God declared his Justice at this time.

2 Why at this time.

Rom. 3. 25. 1 Touching the manner how God declared his Justice, that must be fetched from its coherence with verse 25. and there it is said, that God declared his justice in setting forth Christ to be a propitiatory, through faith in his blood, for the remission of sins.

1 Hence it is evident, that God had covenanted to, and with Christ, that if he would undertake to be the seed of the Woman, and in that humane nature to combate with the Enemy, Sathan, to the shedding of his blood, and would still continue obedient to the death, and at last make his soul a sacrifice, then he should be his Mercy-seat, and then he would be reconciled to all beleevers, and forgive them their sins, through faith in his blood; and therefore as soon as sinners are united to Christ by faith, it is Gods Justice or his Righteousnesse to remit their sins that are past, as I shewed before in 1 *Joh.* 1. 9. and more fully in 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. and *Heb.* 8. 12.

Christ is Gods Mercy-seat in point of satisfaction. Heb. 4. 16. 2 This very name *His* Propitiatory, whence God declares his Justice in remitting sins, doth plainly tell us, (but that we are dull of hearing) that Christs satisfaction was not *Solutio ejusdem*, but *tantidem*, by vertue of the voluntary Covenant, or else what need is there that God should declare his justice from his Propitiatory, or from his Mercy-seat, or from his Throne of grace? as Christ by his Satisfaction is called in *Heb.* 4. 16. if Christs satisfaction had been *solutio ejusdem*, as Mr. *Norton* holds, then it should have been more fitly said that God declared his justice from his Justice-seat, and not from his Mercy-seat; but because Christs death and sacrifice was (by the voluntary positive Law and Covenant) made to be the *Tantidem* for beleevers, as it is evident by the former instance of the half shekels,

shekels, which was made to be the full price of the Redemption of their lives, formally only, by Gods voluntary Covenant, therefore it is most fitly said, that God declared his justice from his Mercy-seat.

3 This phrase (*Capporeth*) his Propitiatory, or his Mercy-seat, is first used in *Exod.*25.17. And it is commonly used, saith *Ainsworth*, to set forth Gods merciful covering of sins, as in *Psal.*65.4. where it is translated by the Seventy, with the allowance of the Holy Ghost, in *Heb.*9.5. *Hilasterion*, that is, a Propitiatory, or a Covering Mercy-seat; and saith he, this is applied by the Apostle to Christ, *Rom.*3.25. See more of *Gapbar* in Chap.14.Sect.6.*Reply* 8. Psal.65.4.

The Hebrew *Capbar*, saith *Ainsworth*, is applied to the covering of an angry countenance, as in *Gen.*32.20. There *Jacob* is said to cover *Esau's* angry face, or to appease his anger, by a liberal and acceptable gift; and this word *Capbar*, saith *Ainsworth*, is often used in the Law, for the covering or taking away of offence, by pacifying Gods anger, by gifts and sacrifices, and typified that Christ should give himself to be a Propitiatory Sacrifice for the procuring of Gods Attonement whereby sin is covered, or passed by, *Exod.*29.36. *Lev.*1.4. *Lev.*4.20. 26.*&c.* Gen.32.20.

Christs sacrifice is called a sacrifice of Attonement, because it doth appease Gods angry face, & procure his Attonement to believing sinners.

And thus Gods angry face was covered, or appeased, by the burnt offering of Christs body, as soon as he had finished all his sufferings; for he offered himself by the holy fire of his eternal Spirit (so Dr. *Taylor* doth once make the type of Fire to speak in *Noahs* sacrifice) in *Heb.*9.14. for as the Altar did signifie the God-head of Christ, so the fire of the Altar must be alike type of the God-head of Christ also; and thus Christ was the Mediator of the New Testament through this kind of death, *Heb.*9 14, 15, 16. by which hee procured Gods Attonement or Reconciliation for the iniquity of the many, and so he became his Mercy-seat; and after this manner God set forth Christ to be his Propitiatory through faith in his blood, to declare his Righteousnesse by remitting sin. Heb.9.14.

4 *Peter Martyr* doth open this phrase *His Righteousnesse* (or the justice of God) in *Rom.*3.21. thus, If a man do more narrowly consider this word, the Justice or Righteousnesse of God, It is the mercy of God which he bestoweth upon us through Christ.

Rom. 10. 3. And in *Rom.* 10. 3. He calls the justice of God, Gods forgiveneſſe; and ſaith he, I have in another place admoniſhed, that the Hebrew word *Tzedec*, which our men have tranſlated Righteouſneſſe, ſignifieth rather Goodneſſe and Mercy; and therefore to this day the Jews call Alms by that name; and ſaith he, *Ambroſe* on this place is of the ſelf-ſame mind; and ſee more how *Peter Martyr* doth expound Gods Righteouſneſſe, in my *Reply* on 2 *Cor.* 5. 21.

5 I have alſo ſhewed in the Dialogue, page 118. that *Tzedec*, Juſtice or Righteouſneſſe, is often tranſlated by the Seventy, Goodneſſe or Mercy, as in *Pſal.* 24. 5. *Pſ.* 33. 5. *Pſ.* 103. 6. *Eſ.* 1. 27 *Dan.* 4. 27 *Dan.* 9. 16. *Deut.* 24. 13. and their Tranſlation doth well agree to the true ſenſe of *Pſ* 112. 4, 9. and to *Pſ.* 94. 15. where God is ſaid to turn Judgement into juſtice, namely to turn vindicative juſtice, into merciful juſtice; for indeed God hath an exact way of merciful juſtice by the ſatisfaction of Chriſt, according to the voluntary poſitive Law and Covenant to beleevers, as if the rigor of his moral Curſe had been executed on their Surety in kind, and better too, becauſe the firſt way was conſtituted to be the way, and the other is but imaginary, according to the legal proceedings of Court-juſtice. And indeed, the Juſtice or Righteouſneſſe of God the Father, wherein he is juſt, according to his Covenant with Chriſt, to forgive them their ſins that do beleeve in the death and ſacrifice of Chriſt, is an example of the higheſt degree of Mercy, Charity, and Alms, that the world can afford.

Pſal. 94. 15.

6 God is ſaid to judge the world in Juſtice, namely, in his merciful juſtice, *Pſal.* 96. 13. *Pſal.* 98. 9. *Pſal.* 68. 5. *Pſal.* 146. 7, 8. And it is ſaid in *Act.* 17. 31. *That God hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in Righteouſneſſe* (ſome underſtand it of Gods vindicative juſtice on the impenitent at the day of Judgment,) but *Broughton* reads it in Mercy, or in merciful juſtice, namely, by his Goſpel of grace, declaring his merciful juſtice in judging the world by it; for by his Goſpel of grace he doth judge the world in favour to their poor, blind, and captivated ſouls, as in *Eſa.* 42. 1, 2 3 4. and in *Mat.* 12 18. and in *Joh.* 12. 31. and *Obad.* verſ. 21. and ſee *Broughton* alſo in *Job* 37. 23.

By theſe, and ſuch like particulars, we may ſee how God was juſt according to his Covenant with Chriſt, to declare his

his righteousnes by forgiving the sins of beleevers for his sake; and from that Covenant with Christ, he hath also Covenanted with the Elect, mercifully *to forgive their iniquities, and to remember their sins no more*, Jer.31.34. which is expounded thus in *Heb.*8.12. I will be pacified or reconciled to their unrighteousnes; and this is called God the Fathers righteousnes, whereby he makes a sinner righteous.

Secondly, I come now to answer the second Question, *Why did God declare his Justice or his Righteousnes at this time?*

The answer is, that he might be just, *and the Justifier of him that beleeveth in Jesus.*

God declared the exact time when he would fulfil his Promise and Covenant, by his Angel *Gabriel* to *Daniel*; namely, that from his prayer, to the death of the Messiah, it should be exactly Four hundred and ninety years, and that then the Messiah by his death and sacrifice should end all legal sin-offerings, and finish all trespas-offerings, and make reconciliation for iniquity, and (so by that means) bring in (or procure) an eternal Righteousnes, or an eternal Reconciliation, instead of their typical Righteousnes; for, by the language of the Law we are taught, that a sinners righteousnes doth consist in Gods reconciliation, or in Gods forgiveness, and receiving into favor, *Dan.*9.24. and in relation to this *Paul* saith, *That when the fulness of the time* (spoken of by *Daniel*) *was come, God sent forth his Son made of a woman, made under the Law* (namely, under the Law of Rites, that he by his death might fulfil those typical Rites) *to redeem them that were under the Law, that we might receive the Adoption of Sons*: So then, as Christ was just in making satisfaction according to Covenant in the exact time foretold for mans redemption; so God upon that performance covenanted to declare his Justice at this time to all beleevers in all the Nations of the world, that he might be just, and the justifier of him that beleeveth in Jesus, by forgiving their sins, and not remembring their iniquities, *Heb.*8.12. See *Aims.* also in *Psal.*25.11. and therefore Christ did now send abroad his Apostles, to beseech men to be reconciled to God, 2 *Cor.*5.20.

The end of Gods merciful justice declared from his Mercy-seat in Christs satisfaction, was, that he might be just, and that he might be the justifier of beleeving sinners. *Dan.* 9.24. *Gal.* 4. 4, 5.

Secondly, I find that Dr. *Hamon* (and others) doth thus paraphrase upon the word צדיק, *just*, in *Mat.* 1.19. *Joseph*

being a juſt man, that is (ſaith he) being a merciful pious man, was not willing to expoſe or ſubject *Mary* to the publick and ſhameful puniſhment, which among the Jews belonged to thoſe women, whom the Husbands, when they firſt came to them, found not to bee Virgins, was willing ſecretly to diſmiſs her, that ſhe not being known to be betrothed to him, might only be liable to the puniſhment of Fornication, *viz.* Infamy, not death.

And in his Annotations, he ſaith thus, The word *Juſt*, in Greek, is anſwerable to the *Hebrew*, and ſignifies ordinarily works of Mercy and Charity; of which when *Maymonides* ſets down ſeven ſorts or degrees, the ſeventh is diſtinctly Righteouſneſs or Juſtice, and ſo Juſtice, in *Deut.* 24. 13. both according to the context, and the 70 is Mercy. So when Rabbins ſay, There are two Thrones, the one of Judgement, and the other of Mercy; the latter is ſo ſtiled by the Author to the *Hebrews*, Chap. 4. 16. and ſo *Pſal.* 112. 9. he hath given to the poor, and his righteouſneſs, *i.e.* his bounty to the poor, So *Iſa.* 58. 7, 8. and *Mat.* 6. 1. where the vulgar reading is *juſtitiam*, and that for almes in that place.

Proportionable to theſe acceptions of the word (ſaith he) the righteouſneſs of *Joſeph* ſhall here ſignifie, not ſtrict legal Juſtice, but peculiarly Goodneſs and Clemency, in not bringing *Mary* to the capital puniſhment of ſtoning, for her being with child, according to the Law, in *Deut.* 22. but he thought to put her away privately, and ſo to keep the betrothing private, that ſo ſhe might ſuffer no more but infamy for Fornication. In this point of clemency, is *Joſephs* juſtice commendable.

But on *Rom.* 3. 26. he ſaith thus, The word δικαιος, *juſt*, ſignifieth, one that is merciful or charitable, as hath been ſhewed on *Mat.* 1. 19. And accordingly, it may be obſerved, that the word, ſeldom, in theſe books of the New Teſtament, if ever, belongs, or is applied, to the act of vindicative Juſtice; But as there, in the caſe of *Joſeph* (who would not offer his wife to legal puniſhment, and therefore is called δικαιος, *righteous*) for the abating of the rigor of exact Law, and bringing in moderation or equity, or mercy inſtead of it.

Accordingly (ſaith he) it is here to be reſolved, That this phraſe

phraſe being uſed of God [*That God may be juſt or righteous*] it muſt be underſtood to denote his mercy, and goodneſs, and clemency in pardoning and forgiving ſins; that being the thing looked on in the many foregoing expreſſions, as *our being juſtified freely by his grace*, in ver. 24. The propitiatory, ver. 25. Gods righteouſneſs, *i.e.* his merciſull dealing with men under the ſecond Covenant, Verſe 25, 26. the remiſſion of ſins, and forbearance, Verſe 25. And (ſaith he) the word δικαιος, *juſt* (or righteous) being ſo commonly taken in the notion of mercifulneſs, and ſo ſeldom in this of vindicative Juſtice, there is no reaſon to interpret it thus in this place.

Though this of Dr. *Hamon* do not fully accord to my former interpretation of Gods righteouſneſs, yet his reaſons are very ſolid to ſhew that Gods Juſtice here is not to be taken as Mr. *Norton* doth, for vindicative Juſtice.

Fourthly, It is obſervable, that as the Greek word δικαιος, *juſt*, is often put for one that is pious and merciful, So the 70 put one that is pious, for *Tzedec*, *juſtice*, in *Iſa.* 24.16. and ſo alſo the Hebrew word *Cheſed*, *mercy*, is put for one that is pious and juſt, and therefore the Seventy do often render it Juſtice, as in *Gen.* 19.19. *Gen.* 20.13. & 21.23. & 24.27. and in 49, ſee *Amſ.* & 32.10. & *Exod.* 15.13. & 34.7. & *Prov.* 20.28. & *Iſa.* 63.7. And the reaſon is plain, becauſe Juſtice moderated is Mercy. And to this purpoſe alſo do our larger Annotations ſpeak, on *Pſal.* 22.31. And ſaith Mr. *Ball* on the Covenant, p. 21. The demonſtration of Gods revenging Juſtice, ſpringeth not from the neceſſity of his nature, but from his voluntary diſpoſition.

By theſe particulars, I beleeve, it will be evident to the Judicious, that none of all the three Scriptures which Mr. *Norton* hath cited to prove his Aſſumption, do prove it; namely, that Chriſt did ſatisfie Gods Juſtice, by ſuffering his vindicative Juſtice.

And therefore the point of ſatisfaction, as it is ſtated in the Dialogue, is ſound and good ſtill, notwithſtanding all that Mr. *Norton* hath ſaid, or can ſay againſt it.

SECT. 2.

Mr. Nortons *Answer to the several Scriptures cited by the Dialogue, to prove the question stated,* [*Examined.*]

THe Dialogue saith thus, in p.2. Though I say, that Christ did not suffer his Fathers wrath, neither in whole or in part, yet I affirm, that he suffered all things, in all circumstances, just according to the Predictions of all the Prophets, even to the nodding of the head, and the spitting in the face; as these Scriptures do testifie.

1. *Peter* told the Jews, That *they had killed the Prince of life, as God before had shewed by the mouth of all his Prophets, that Christ should suffer, and he fulfilled it,* So Act.3.17,18.

Mr. Norton doth Answer thus.

This may include (saith he) *but certainly excludes not the suffering of the wrath of God.*

Reply 1. He should have shewed, that this Scripture did certainly include, that Christ did suffer from Gods wrath; especially seeing it is cited for a proof of the Question stated; but I have often shewed, that God hath shewed from all his Prophets, from *Gen.*3.15. that God appointed Satan to set all his Instruments on work to persecute Christ, and to peirce him in the foot-soals, with an ignominious and painful death, as a Malefactor, on the Cross, to try if he could pervert him in the course of his obedience, and so to hinder Christs death from being a perfect sacrifice, by which means only the Devils head-piece must be broken.

The second Scripture cited in the Dialogue, is in *Mat.* 16.21. Christ told his Disciples, that he *must go to Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the Elders, and Chief Priests, and Scribes, and be killed, and raised again the third day.*

Mr.

Mr. *Norton* Answers thus:

True: *Yet*, saith he, *Matthew doth not there shew that he must not suffer the wrath of God.*

Reply 2. If *Matthew* had known that such a Tenent would have been broached, he would doubtless (if the Spirit of God had permitted) have shewed, that he must not have suffered the wrath of God; but it had been for Mr. *Nortons* honor, if he could have shewed, that Christ told his Disciples, *That he must go to Jerusalem to suffer many things there* from the immediate wrath of God, as well as from Sathans instruments, and then the Reader might have been satisfied.

The third Scripture cited by the Dialogue is in *Luke* 24.25, 26,44.46.

Mr. *Norton* Answers.

These words (saith he) *conclude that Christ was to suffer*: *But the word All*, saith he, in vers. 26. *includes the suffering of Divine Justice.*

Reply 3. In the two former Scriptures he could not find any particle for the proving that Christ suffered divine Justice; but now in *Luke* 24.26. he finds it in the word *All*, and yet there is no *All* in that verse. Mr. *Norton* will rather coyn Scripture-words, than want a proof of Christs suffering from Gods immediate wrath.

The fourth Scripture cited by the Dialogue is *Act.* 13.27,28.

He Answers thus:

The word All *in this Text* (saith he) *is to be taken in a limited sense, for all things that were written of him, to be fulfilled by the Romans and the Jews, as the instruments thereof.*

Reply 4. In this Answer he doth but repeat the full and true sense of the Dialogue, and in so doing, he justifies the sense of the Dialogue.

Now let the Reader judge how well he hath confuted the Dialogues proofs for the stating of the case.

And

And whether this Answer of his be not rather a confused shuffling of an Answer, than an Answer to satisfie any judicious Reader.

CHAP. X.

The Examination of Mr. Nortons *Exposition of* Gen.2.17. (in *page* 21.)

For the true understanding whereof, saith Mr. *Norton*, consider these three things;

1 *What is here intended by Death,*
2 *The Distribution of Death,*
3 *The Application of that Distribution.*

SECT. I.

1 Saith he, *The Commination,* Thou shalt surely dye, *is not particular concerning some kind of death, but indefinite, therefore equivalent to an universal, comprehending all kinds of Death.*

Reply 1. I Have shewed in Chap.2. Sect.3. from two circumstances in this Text of *Gen.*2.17. that the death there threatned, is limited to a spiritual death in sin only.

2 In his Distribution. And

3 In his Application of this Death, he brings Christ within the compasse of it two wayes:

1 By separation of his soul from his body, which he makes to be a temporal and penal death in Christ.

2 By the separation of his soul from the sense of the good things of the promise, and the presence of the evill things in the commination, which he calls Total, Temporal, and properly Penal in Christ.

Reply

Reply 2. I deny that the death of Christ, namely, the separation of his soul from his body, was a proper penal death; for the Law of God threatens no man with a penal death, nor yet with any other true curse, but sinners themselves.

The death of Christ could not be a penal death, because Gods Law threatens none with a penal death but sinners themselves.

Sin and Death (saith *Peter Martyr*) is compared as cause and effect; But (saith he) here we must exempt Christ only, who notwithstanding he knew no sin, yet for our sakes he dyed; But (saith he) Death had no dominion over him, because he of his own accord, did suffer it for our salvation. The like speech of his, I have cited in page 54.

In his Common places part 2. p. 244.

Had not Christ dyed voluntarily, saith *Bernard* (*ad milites Templi, cap.* 11.) that death had not been meritorious; how much more unworthily he dyed who deserved not death, so much more justly (man) liveth for whom he dyed; what justice, thou wilt ask, is this, that an innocent should dye for a malefactor? It is no justice, it is mercy; If it were justice, then should he not dye freely, but indebted thereto, and if indebted, then indeed he should dye, but the other for whom he dyed, should not live; yet though it be not justice, it is not against justice, otherwise he could not be both just and merciful.

These Testimonies of the Orthodox (and more to this purpose I might bring) do point-blank oppose Mr. *Nortons* Tenent, that Christs death was inflicted on him from Gods penal justice, through the meritorious cause of sin, as our death is on us. But it is no such matter, Christs death is of another nature, because he undertook it from the voluntary Cause and Covenant onely, upon condition of meriting the destruction of Satans Head-plot, and the redeeming of all the Elect thereby; and in this respect his obedience, in giving his life, was covenanted to be accepted by the Father as a free gift, and as the richest Present that the world could afford; namely, as a sacrifice of Attonement or Reconciliation, smelling like a most sweet savor in the nostrils of God; and in this respect his death is the ground of merit; but had it been inflicted on him from Gods penal wrath, as deserved, through the imputation of sin, it had merited nothing, as *Bernard* speaks above.

The true nature of Christs death was to be a sacrifice.

When conditions are made by a voluntary Covenant for the winning or meriting of a rich prize, he that will strive for the mastery, with his opposite Champion, for the winning of the said Prize, must strive lawfully, that is to say, in obedience to those Laws; and he must be willing to undergo all the hardships that he must meet withall from his opposite Champion; it may be, to the forcing of his body into an Agony, it may be, to the breaking of his body, and to the shedding of much blood; all this he must do from the voluntary cause & from the voluntary Covenant; for the Masters of the Game do not compel any man to undertake these difficult services, neither do they out of anger and wrath inflict any of the said punishments, though the opposite party may happily do what he can in anger to pervert the Combaters obedience, and to provoke him to some miscarriage, against the Laws of the prize, that so he may not win the prize from him: Even so Jesus Christ, *the author and finisher of our Faith, for the joy that was set before him, indured the cross, despising the shame, and is now set down* (as a Victor over Satan, and all his potent Instruments) *at the right hand of God*, having first endured the cross, and the contradiction of sinners; and hath spoyled Principalities and Powers in it, namely, in his death on the cross, which by Gods appointment did strive for the mastery with him, and the Devil did in anger provoke him what he could, to spoil his obedience, and so to hinder him from destroying his head-plot, and so from winning the prize, namely, from the salvation of the Elect; and the Devil proceeded so far in his rage, that he peirced him in the foot-soals for a wicked Malefactor.

A description of Christs merit.

These things I bring to exemplifie my meaning, that the death of Christ was not a proper penal death inflicted from the wrath of God, as Mr. *Norton* doth make it to be in his distribution: But it was a death agreed on by the voluntary Covenant, having respect unto the curse accidentally; because his Combater Satan had a commission from God to do his worst to make him a sinner, and so to use him as a Malefactor, by putting him to an ignominious and cursed death, and so to disturb his patience if he could: but because Christ continued constant in his obedience, therefore he merited the redemption of all the Elect, from the curse of the Law. And this is a true description of merit,

rit, whereby God made himself a debtor to Christ.

But to affirm that the death of Christ did proceed from Gods penal curse, as an effect from the cause (as *Mr. Norton* affirms) doth utterly destroy the merit of his death and Sacrifice, as *Bernard* said above, and as you may see further in Ch. 12. at Reply 17.

It is appointed (saith the Apostle) *unto men once to die, Heb.* 9. 27, 28. This bodily death was not appointed till after *Adams* conversion, for his conversion is set out in *Gen.* 3. 15. and his bodily death was not threatned till four verses after, namely, in verse 19. This appointment was for mankind that were guilty of original sin, and therefore the Apostle saith, *it is appointed unto men once to die*, namely, to men that were guilty of original sin; but the Apostle doth not say in *Heb.* 9. 27. that it was appointed for Christ to die by that sentence; but he varies that phrase when he comes to speak of the death of Christ, and saith, *So Christ was offered to bear the sins of the many*, thereby shewing, that the nature of his death was to be a sacrifice, and so to be of a differing nature from our compulsory death, and that the end of it was to bear away the sins of the many, in procuring Gods free pardon and forgiveness by his death and sacrifice. Heb. 9. 27, 28

So then I may well conclude, That as Christs begetting was not like our begetting, so his death, in the formality of it, was not like our death; for though he suffered as a malefactor in his combating with Satan and his Instruments from the voluntary Cause and Covenant; so also in the point of separating his soul from his body, he did it as a Mediator, by his own Priestly power, and not by Satans power, as I shall shew, God willing, more at large hereafter, in my Reply to *Psal.* 22. 1. and to *Matth.* 27. 46.

2 I come now to speak to the second part of his distribution of death to the soul of Christ, by separating it from the sense of the good things in the promise, and by inflicting the evill things in the commination. But this I have already denied, and given my Reasons, in Chap. 2. Sect. 3. and in Chap. 4. And therefore now I will onely propound three Questions to the consideration of the learned, for the further clearing of this point.

Q. 1. Whereas Mr. *Norton* in p. 21, makes death in sin, and

death for ſin, in their ſeveral branches (together with the evil of affliction) to flow from the commination in *Gen.* 2. 17. (as an effect from the cauſe) as the proper wages of *Adams* firſt ſin, *Rom.* 5. 21. and 6. 23.

My firſt Queſtion from hence is this, Whether Mr. *Norton* be not all this while to be underſtood, as ſpeaking of ſin, and the curſe thereof, as it is to be conſidered *de jure*, namely, of the due deſert of ſin?

Secondly, Whereas he doth apply the ſeveral branches of his death, to ſeveral ſorts of perſons, ſome to the Reprobates, and ſome to the Elect, in differing reſpects; Whether he be not to be underſtood as ſpeaking of ſin, and the curſe thereof, as it is to be conſidered *de facto*, namely, in the event, and as it fell out to be executed, and that in a various manner; namely one way on the Elect, and another way on the Reprobate?

Queſt. 2. In judging what kind of death is eſſential to *Adams* ſin, as naturally flowing from the curſe, as an effect from the cauſe; Whether is it more ſuitable to look at ſin and the curſe thereof, as it is to be conſidered *de jure*, or as it is to be conſidered *de facto*, or as it is both ways to be conſidered, ſeeing the curſe, *de facto*, in relation to the Elect, was altered by the Goſpel interceding?

Queſt. 3. In conſidering the ſeveral branches of death, which of them are eſſential (and flowing naturally either from *Adams* firſt ſin, or from our Original ſin) as a proper Effect from the Cauſe, and which of them are accidental, not flowing from ſin as ſin, (as Mr. *Nortons* diſtribution ſpeaketh) but rather accidentally, by means of ſome other thing.

If theſe Queſtions were rightly reſolved, and rightly applied to the points in agitation, the difficulties of this Controverſie would be much eaſier: And I conceive my expoſition of the nature of the death threatned in *Gen.* 2. 17. as I have explained it in Chap. 2. Sect. 3. will give great light to the clearing of theſe three Queſtions.

SECT.

SECT. 2.

NOw I come to examine his Expoſition of *Gen.* 2.17. more particularly.

In p. 23. ſaith Mr. *Norton*, the meaning of theſe words, *In the day thou eateſt thereof, thou ſhalt die*, Is this,

If man ſin, man ſhall die, either in his own perſon, as the Reprobate, or in the perſon of the man Chriſt Jeſus, the Surety of the Elect, according to the diſtribution above; ſo is the Text a full and univerſal Truth; Man ſins, and man dies.

Reply 3. The plain letter of the Text ſaith, *If thou ſinneſt, thou ſhalt die*; and ſo the Text is a full and univerſal Truth; for this Law was given as an univerſal Law to *Adam*, namely, as he was the head of all mankind, in the firſt Covenant, which was made with him touching mans nature in general, and therefore it holds all his natural poſterity, whether Elect or Reprobate, alike guilty of death, namely, of a ſpiritual death in ſin, though it pleaſed God afterwards to make a difference by the promiſed ſeed, but this difference was not made in the firſt Covenant, but in the ſecond, in *Gen.* 3. 15. Ezek. 18. 4, 20

Secondly, Therefore I deny that this Text did intend dying in the perſon of the man Chriſt Jeſus our Surety, for then he muſt have died our death in ſin; But his death was wholly founded in another Covenant, namely, in the voluntary Covenant, as I have often ſaid before.

But ſaith Mr. *Norton* in the cloſe of his Speech,

This Text is an univerſal and full Truth, Man ſins, and man dyes.

Reply 4. In this ſpeech he confounds himſelf, for he takes the word *Man* ambiguouſly.

1 Saith he, *man ſins*, here Man is taken *ſpecifice*, for mankind.

2 Saith he, *Man dies*, here the word *man*, as it relates to the Elect, is taken *numerice*, and as it relates to Christ, so it must be taken for an individual person, as I have noted formerly in answer to *Ezek.* 18.4. in chap. 6.

This speech, man sins, and man dies, is but a paralogism,

And so this elegant speech, *Man sins, and man dies*, is not *ad idem*, It is but a Paralogism, namely, a deceitful Sylogism, which seemeth true when it is not,

But saith Mr. *Norton* in p. 24.

This Text of Gen. 2. 17. *is Gods judicial denunciation of the punishment of sin, with a reservation of his purpose concerning the execution of the execution of it (or as it was in his manuscript concerning the manner of the execution of it) and truly, I cannot but wonder at his alteration from his Manuscript, to such an uncouth expression, except it be to puzzle his Reader.*

Christ was not in the same obligation with *Adam*, as his Surety to the first Covenant

Reply 5. I would fain know, why this reservation of Gods purpose is mentioned; It seems, it is for this purpose, to hook in Christ as a Surety within the compass of this Text, and so to make the curse contained in it due to him, as it appears both by his answer to his fourth Query in p. 6. (which hath been already examined) and also by his daring expressions in p. 25. If Christ, saith he, be not within the compass of this Text, then the Text is not true; and a little after, Because elect sinners, not dying in their own persons, must die in their Surety, or else the Text is not a truth. Modesty would rather have said, or else the Text is not truly expounded.

2 Had Mr. *Norton* said thus, This Text is Gods judicial denunciation of sin, (and so had wholly left out his reservation of the execution of the execution of it) I should have assented to him.

As Gen. 2. 17. respects eternal death; so it speaks rather of the desert of sin, than of the event.

3 Take the commination for the present event of *Adams* sin, and then it was the present death of the nature of all mankind in sin; but take the commination as it respected eternal death, (as Mr. *Norton* takes it) then it speaks onely of the desert of *Adams* sin, and not of the event to *Adam* and his elect posterity, for he was delivered from the event, by the interposition of the promised seed, and so God was pleased to alter the event of the commi-

commination of the first Covenant, by his grace declared in the new Covenant, in *Gen.*3.15.

4 This reason makes it evident, that this Text hath not any such reservation (as above mentioned) Because the commination in this Text must accord with other the like comminations, which do limit the curse threatned, to the same numerical and individual persons that are inherent and formal sinners, as in *Deut.*27.26. *Gal.*3.10. *Ezek.*18.4. Therefore to assert the suffering of Hell torments from this Text, by one that never was a sinner inherently, would have been held a paradox in Divinity to our fore-fathers; and to affirm that Christ suffered the second death, from this Text, that never was guilty of the first death, never dead in sin, can be no less I think than a monster in Religion.

5 This reason also makes it evident that the first Covenant could not contain a compleat rule of Gods relative Justice (yea though it be granted, that it was made in relation to *Adams* obedience or disobedience to the moral Law of Nature,) because it neither takes in the sins against the Gospel, nor yet the duties, nor the rewards of it, these are supplied by the Gospel in the Covenant of Grace; God did add what his good pleasure was to add, when he published the Gospel, which is comprized in *Gen.* 3.15.

Though the first Covenant be supposed to be made in relation to Adams obedience or disobedience to the moral Law of nature, yet in that sense it is not a compleat Rule of relative Justice

6 This commination in *Gen.*2.17. doth hold all the Elect as well as the Reprobate alike guilty of the death there threatned, in case *Adam* disobeyed by eating the forbidden fruit. Or thus, both the Elect and the Reprobate are alike guilty of *Adams* sin, and therefore they are alike under the guilt of original sin, *Rom.*3.19,20. therefore *de jure*, they are both alike under the same curse, though after a while, the Elect, *de facto* are not under the curse of eternal death by means of the promise of Christ intervening, *Gen.*3.15. *Rom.*8.1. *Gal.*3.13. *Col.*2.14.

1 Hence it follows, that the first Covenant was alterable by the Gospel.

2 Hence it follows, that in case this commination doth speak of eternal death, then it speaks of the desert, rather than of the event, of *Adams* sin in relation to the Elect.

SECT.

SECT. 3.

Gen. 2.17. doth not comprehend Christ within the compass of it.

THis Text (saith the Dialogue) doth not comprehend Jesus Christ within the compass of it; for this Text is part of that Covenant which God made with *Adam* and his posterity, respecting the happiness they had by creation.

Mr. *Norton* in p. 24. answers the Dialogue thus;

Though Christ doth not fall within the compass of the Covenant of works; it doth not follow that he is excluded the compass of the Text.

Reply 1. Though he grants that Christ is not within the compass of the Covenant of works, yet (saith he) he is not excluded the compass of the Text, namely, of *Gen.* 2.17. or else he answers not to the Dialogue; and he is also most confident that Christ must be contained in that Text, or else (saith he in p. 23.) the Text is not true.

Now if Christ be contained within the compass of this Text of *Gen.* 2.17. then he must be contained either within the prohibition, or else within the commination; But he cannot be contained in either of these, as I shall shew by and by.

But Mr. *Norton* proves that Christ may be within the compass of this Text, thus;

Damnation (saith he) *is no part of the Gospel, yet it is a part of that verse wherein the Gospel is revealed; He that is baptized shall be saved, he that believeth not is damned.*

Reply 2. If Mr. *Norton* had paralleld this sentence of the Gospel with *Gen.* 3.15. he had hit the nail, but because he doth parallel it with *Gen.* 2.17. he hath mist it. But to speak more fully, the word *Gospel* must be considered two ways.

First, Either strictly, for the glad tidings of salvation onely.

Or secondly, More largely, not only for the glad tidings of Salvation,

salvation, but also as comprehending other appurtenances belonging to that Covenant, as Ceremonies or Seals, and so in case of neglect, or contempt, punishments; In the first sense the threatning of Damnation is no part of the Gospel; but in the second sense it is.

Now seeing Mr. *Norton* scope in this Instance, is to make good his answer to the Dialogue, namely, that though Christ doth not fall within the compasse of the Covenant of works, yet that he was contained within the compasse of that Text that speaks of the first Covenant of works; even as Damnation, though it be no part of the Gospel, yet is it contained within the compasse of that verse which reveals the Gospel.

I say, the scope of this Instance being brought to make good that Answer; The judicious Reader will easily see that this Instance hath not truth in it, and therefore he hath not as yet proved, that Christ was contained within that Text of *Gen.* 2. 17.

But still Mr. *Norton* strives to make it good, *That Christ was comprehended within the compasse of that Text*; for saith he, in page 24, 25. *Adam in his eating intended and prohibited, was a figure of Christ to come*, Rom. 5. 14. Rom. 5. 14.

Reply 3. Not properly in his eating intended and prohibited; But in the effects that followed his eating prohibited; the typical Resemblance that is between *Adam* and *Christ*, lyes only in some general things, as thus; *Adam* was the head of that Covenant, which God made with him concerning the nature of all mankind, and so Christ was the head of the Covenant of grace, which God made with him concerning the Regenerating of the nature of all the Elect; *Adam* by his disobedience merited a corrupt nature to all his posterity, and Christ by his obedience even to death, merited a sanctified nature to all his elect seed. The Reader may fetch the parallel from *P. Martyr*, *Dr. Willet*, and others, on *Rom.* 5. 19. Rom. 5. 19.

But what is the inference that Mr. *Norton* makes? namely, *That Christ is contained within the compasse of this Text.* I say, it follows not; for though there may be a resemblance between the first and second *Adam* in many other things, yet not

in all things; and therefore in some things *Adam* was no figure of Christ; as for example, He was no figure of Christ in bearing the essential Curse. And that is the point which *Mr. Norton* doth aim at in this Text.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 25. *It is certain* (though Adam during the first Covenant perceived it not) *that Christ was couched and comprehended in some part of the revealed will of God, during the first Covenant; It is very probable*, saith he, *That the Tree of life in Gen. 2. 9. was a figure of Christ, who is called, and indeed is the Tree of life*, Rev. 22. 2. *And*, saith he, *If Christ be not within the compasse of the Text, the Text is not true.*

Reply. 4. We may soon lose our selves in this dispute, if wee keep not close to the point of the Dialogue in hand, which Mr. *Norton* labors to confute.

The Dialogue saith, this text of *Gen.* 2. 17. doth not include Christ within the compasse of it, as liable to the death there threatned: But Mr. *Norton* cites another text to prove it, namely *Gen* 2. 9. and yet he affirmed that Christ was within the compasse of this text of *Gen.* 2. 17. namely as the Satety of the Elect, and that thereby he was made liable to suffer the death there threatned; for saith he, *Man sins, and man dyes* (by vertue of this Text) *either in his own person, or in the Man Christ Jesus.*

But how doth all this that Mr. *Norton* hath said, suit to the point in hand? and how doth it tend to disprove what the Dialogue affirms?

1 Saith he, *It is certain, that Christ was couched in this Text*, but in his proof he only saith, *It is very probable that the Tree of life, &c.* in his Proposition he affirmeth, *It is certain*; but in his proof he saith, *It is no more but probable.*

But let his words be a little further examined; *Where is Christ couched?*

1 One while he tells us, That he is couched, and intended in some part of the revealed will of God, during the first Covenant.

2 Another while he tells us, That it is probable that the Tree of life in *Gen.* 2. 9. was a figure of Christ.

3 Another time he saith, That Christ must be within the com-

compasse of this Text of *Gen.*2.17. or else the Text is not true.

All these three considerations laid together, do prove that Christ is contained somewhere, or no where, in some Text, or in no Text.

And now let the judicious Reader judge what his Proposition, and his Proof doth amount to.

2 Examine his Discourse a little further; The Dialogue affirmeth, that Christ falls not within the compasse of this Text in *Gen.*2.17.

The Dialogue doth not meddle whether Christ was couched in any other Text.

2 The Dialogue denies that Christ was not within this text as liable to the death there threatned. Now then let it bee supposed that Mr. *Norton* could produce some other text, during the first Covenant, wherein Christ was included or prefigured: Suppose the Tree of life was a figure of him, though it be denied both by Mr. *Shepherd*, and Mr. *Burges*, and others, as I have noted in Chap.2. yet except he can prove that Christ was comprehended in this text, and that hee was thereby liable to the death there threatned, he doth but labor to no purpose.

3 Examine his arguing a little further: The Dialogue contends that Christ is not contained in the word *Thou*; *Thou shalt surely dye. Thou* Adam *in thine own person*; *and thou* Adam *in thy Posterity* (saith the Dialogue) *But not thou in thy Surety shalt dye*; The word *Thou shalt dye*, intends no more but the person or persons with whom the first Covenant was made.

But let us consider the Argument that doth arise from Mr. *Nortons* own words; And it may be framed thus:

Christ falls not within the compasse of the first Covenant of works, saith Mr. *Norton* in page 24.

But thou shalt dye (intending thereby the persons with whom the first Covenant was made) *falls within the compass of the first Covenant*, as he affirmeth in his second Proposition.

Therefore Christ falls not within the first Covenant of works, because the word *Thou*, intends the persons only with whom the first Covenant was made.

And thus you see how Mr. Norton hath confuted himself, by proving that Christ was not comprehended within the compasse of *Gen.* 2. 17.

SECT. IV.

IN my former brief Reply to his first Argument, I promised a more full Answer to his *minor*.

I will repeat his whole Argument as it is laid down in his 10 page.

Either Christ suffered the Justice of God, instead of the Elect, denounced against sin in Gen. 2. 17. *or God might dispence with the execution thereof, without the violation of his Justice.*

But God could not dispence with the execution thereof, without the violation of his Justice.

Reply 5. I have sufficiently replied to his *major*, by proving that Christ was not in the same obligation with *Adam* in the first Covenant, In Chap. 2. Sect. 3. and Chap. 6. &c.

2 I say also that his *minor* is unsound; for it affirms that God could not dispence with the execution of the essential Curse, without the violation of his Justice. *What was sometimes spoken* (saith he) *of the Laws of the Medes and Persians, holds true at all times concerning the Law of God, that it altereth not.*

Reply 6. 1 Take the death threatned for a spiritual death in sin, and then we see by experience, that it was formally executed on all mankind, from that instant, to every one that hath life in the womb, even to the end of world, though yet it hath pleased God to mitigate the violent outrage of that death, not onely to the Elect, but also to the Reprobate, while they live in this world.

2 Take the death there threatned for bodily death, and then we see by experience, that it was not formally executed at that present; neither shall it bee formally executed on such as are alive at the day of judgement, *We shall not all dye*, saith the Apostle, 1 *Cor.* 15.

3 Take

3. Take the death there threatned for eternal death in hell, and then we also see by experience, that it was not formally executed on *Adam*; but this is certain, that what God hath threatned against man for sin, he may justly inflict, but he is not alwayes bound to it (except his threatnings be delivered with an oath) Threatnings declare what punishments are due to man for sin, but not what shall infallibly be inflicted, as I have shewed in Chap. 2. Sect. 4.

God doth often dispence with his peremptory threatnings.

2 We see also by experience, that God did often repent of his Threatnings, and thereupon did alter them from what hee had expressed in his revealed will; but not from what he had decreed in his secret will.

As for example, God sent his Prophet *Isaiah* to *Hezekiah*, saying, *Set thy house in order*, for to dye, *thou shalt dye, and not live*. This threatning hath an addition to it more than is expressed in that threatning of *Gen.* 2. 17. for here the threatning is delivered, first, Affirmatively, to dye, *Thou shalt dye*, that is, *Thou shalt surely dye*. And secondly, It is delivered Negatively, *Thou shalt not live*. And yet *Hezekiah* did perswade himself that this threatning was alterable, and therefore he went to God to wrestle it out by prayer, that God would spare his life, and give him a son to sit upon his Throne, and God heard his prayer, and altered his threatning, and yet this sentence seems to be a doubled definitive sentence, more than that in *Gen.* 2. 17. and hence wee see, that God doth allow his people to pray for the alteration of his revealed will, and for the removal of threatned evils, 2 *King.* 20. 1. *Jam.* 5. 13. *Ps.* 50. 15. 2 King. 20. 1.

2. Gods resolution is often hypothetical or conditional, and therefore we may pray for those things that seem contrary to his revealed will, *Ezek.* 3. 17. 21. *Amos* 4. 12.

3. God doth often change his Comminations, for our prayers, *Gen.* 19. 21. *Jon.* 3. 10. *Es.* 38. 25. and therefore *David* prayed for the childs life, after the Prophet had told him positively that the child should dye, 2 *Sam.* 12. and so *Moses* did the like, *Exod.* 32. 14.

4. God doth often seem to will those things that indeed hee willeth not, only to prove us, *Mat.* 15. 23, 24, 26. *Luke* 24. 28. *Exod.* 32. 10. *Numb.* 14. 10.

5. Though God doth threaten all flesh with a bodily death,

yet the Apostle saith also, *That we shall not all dye*, 1 Cor. 15.

Therefore God, we see, doth often alter his peremptory threatnings.

Gen. 20. 3. 2 Take another Instance, God told *Abimelek* in Gen. 20. 3. saying, *Thou art but a dead man*, that is, (saith *Ainsworth*, *Thou shalt surely dye*. This threatning (saith *Traberon* on *Rev.* 4.) seemeth to bee as absolute a threatning as that to *Adam*; and yet indeed saith he, it had a secret condition, which is after expressed in verse 7. *Restore her now to her husband, if thou restore her not* (see the condition now expressed, which at first was reserved) *know, thou shalt surely dye*: But take notice of this, that when God told *Adam*, *If thou eat of the Tree of knowledge, thou shalt surely dye*; there could be no such condition on mans part to alter the sentence of death in sin, for till Christ was revealed, no repentance was ordained to alter Gods threatnings; neither is he tyed to execute his threatnings, except they bee delivered with an oath. God hath left that liberty to Parents and Masters, when they have threatned a child or servant, that in case they commit such a fault they shall be so and so punished; yet when the fault is committed, they may remit the punishment when they see that thereby more advantage will accrue to themselves, or the party offending, or to both, than if the punishment had been inflicted; then who can deny that liberty to God himself, who is a most absolute Supreme?

Jon. 3. 4. 3 Take another Instance, *Jonah* said, *Yet forty dayes, and Nineveh shall be destroyed*, Jon. 3. 4. this threatning is absolute saith *Traberon* (not declaring Gods secret determination) what should fall upon them; yet upon their repentance God altered this threatning.

Lev. 15. 31. 4 Take another Instance in *Lev.* 15. 31. *Thus shall yee separate the children of Israel from their uncleanesse, that in dying they dye not in their uncleanesse, when they defile my Tabernacle that is among them*: This threatning God did sometimes execute, and sometimes he did not execute it, but did alter it at his pleasure, as we may see in the example of such unclean persons as came to the Passeover in the dayes of *Hezekiah*, 2 Chron. 30. 19, 20. Some of them were sick, and weak, and dyed, and others of them at the prayer of *Hezekiah* were healed, and restored to health. And so death is threatned in *Num.* 18. 22. *None of the children*

2 Chr. 30. 19, 20.

of

of Israel shall henceforth come nigh the Tabernacle of the Congregation, lest they bear sin, and dye; yet God dispenced with death to King *Uzziah*, and smote him with leprosie, and *Saul* dyed not, though God was angry with him for medling with the office of sacrificing.

But I intreat the judicious Reader, to take notice, that I produce these instances in opposition to Mr. *Nations* Tenent in his Assumption, where he affirms, That God might not dispence with the execution of the essential death and curse, but that it must be born either by *Adam*, or else by *Adams* Surety; In reference to that I have given four Instances that this phrase, *In dying, Thou shalt dye*, is alterable, even to men that are not in Christ, upon their temporary repentance; as in *Ninive* and *Ahab*.

SECT. V.

But saith Mr. Nation, This threatning was in relation to the breach of the moral Law; for he makes Adams sin in eating the forbidden fruit to be a sin against the moral Law.

Reply 7. I Have shewed in Chap. 2. Sect. 1. That the true nature of the first Covenant stood not in *Adams* obedience or disobedience to the moral Law of nature, but in relation to a positive Law about things indifferent in their own nature, as the eating of the two Trees was, for Gods positive Laws were not ingraven in *Adams* nature, but referred in Gods secret Decree to be imposed on man for an act, or acts, for a time, as he pleased to appoint, and then to be annihilated again.

God's positive Laws were not engraven in *Adams* nature, as his moral Law was.

I grant, that the moral Law of nature did direct *Adam* to obey God in whatsoever positives he should appoint; But yet by the Law of nature, he knew not any of Gods positives, till they were particularly revealed; neither can man, without a special revelation, know the reason of them, because they depended only on the good pleasure of God, and therefore *Adams* moral perfections could not prevent, but that the Devil might deceive him about the reason of positives, as I have shewed in Chap. 2.

I do

2 I do not remember (and I pray let the Judicious consider it) that eternal death is directly threatned for the breach of any outward positive Law, but at the first death in sin, and ever after a bodily death (but eternal death is often directly threatned for Unbelief and Rebellion against the Law of Grace) and therefore the threatning in *Gen.*2. 17. may bee exempted from that threatning, though not from death in sin.

3 Let it bee supposed, that the first Covenant with *Adam* was made in relation to the moral Law (which is denied, and cannot be granted) yet it is evident, that God doth sometimes alter from that Law; for he commanded *Abraham* to kill his only son, which was contray to the sixth Commandement, and hee commanded the Israelites to spoyl the Egyptians of their goods, *Exod.*11.2. and Christ bid the Impotent man, when he was healed, to carry his bed on his back on the Sabbath day.

See *P. Martyr* in Com. pl. par. 2. pag. 190.

These examples shew, that God is not tyed to his revealed moral Laws, as wee are, but that he hath a supreme power to alter from that Rule to his secret Decree; but when God is pleased to bind his promises or threatnings by an oath, then we may be sure his will so revealed is unalterable, because his oath doth alwayes declare what his secret Will and Decree is; And hence it comes to passe, that his word and command which he delivers to us for our rule, is many times alterable, because it is many times differing from his secret Decree. And hence it is, that when his threatnings are annexed to his Laws, it is to shew unto man what his sin deserves, but not what God will certainly execute; for it is his good pleasure sometimes to Relax his threatning, which is a forgiveneſſe of temporal plagues, *Psal.*78.38. 2 *Sam.*12,13,14. for as there are two sorts of punishments threatned, so there are two sorts of pardon, one in relation to temporary, and the other in relation to eternal punishment, and so in like sort there are two sorts of justification.

God doth sometimes alter from the rule of his moral Commands, to his secret Decree.

*Psal.*78 38.

4 This sentence (as it relates to eternal death) in *Gen.*2.17. saith *Perkins*, must be understood with an exception borrowed from the Gospel, or Covenant of Grace, revealed to *Adam* presently after his fall: The exception goes thus, *Thou shalt certainly*

In the Right way of dying well.

talnly dye whensoever thou eatest of the forbidden fruit, except I give thee a deliverance from death, namely, the Seed of the woman to destroy the Devils Head-plot.

And saith *Ursinus*, after that sentence in *Gen.*2.17. there followed the equity, moderation, and lenity of the Gospel; in his *Anſ.* to *Q.*40.

And saith *Baxter*, How can it stand with the truth and justice of God, to dispence with his threatnings? he answers thus to this Question, When threatnings are meerly parts of the Law, and not also predictions of events, and discoveries of Gods purpose thereabout, then they may be dispenced with without any breach of truth; and he gives two Instances to explain his meaning, the last of them runs thus; when God saith, *Thou shalt dye the death*, the meaning is, Death shall bee the due reward of thy sin, so that it may be inflicted at my pleasure, and not that hee should certainly suffer it in the event: And he cites *Vossius*, concluding that the Law was not abrogated, but relaxed, dispenced with, and abrogate. In his *Aphor.* p.18. and in *Append.* p.122.

And to this sense saith another learned Divine: The commination in *Gen.*2.17. is like to some other of Gods threats against the Transgressors of his Law; but it bindeth not God that he shall have power to release or mitigate, what, and to whom it pleaseth him.

The Elect are called the children of wrath as well as others; But saith Mr. *Wotton*, It may bee answered, that the Holy Ghost in these, and such like places of Scripture doth signifie what is due to sin, and sinners, and what their estate must needs bee in their own apprehensions (if they will judge of themselves according to the light of true reason: for there is in sin a certain naughtiness for which it justly may bee, and indeed is odious unto God) but it will not follow thereupon, that he ceaseth to love them, *whom he hath predestinate unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ*, Eph.1.5. *De Reconc. peccatoris, par.*3 *c.*1.

All these Instances do evidence, that Gods threatnings in the event are often alterable, and therefore that his threatning of eternal death in *Gen.*2.17. (in case it be there threatned) is alterable, and doth not bind God, neither to leave the Elect under the power of their spiritual death in sin, nor yet to inflict eternal death, neither on the Elect, nor on their Surety; and

therefore according to the liberty of his eternal will and purpose, hee ordained that the conflict of Christ with Sathan, in continuing obedient to the death of the Crosse, and at last making his soul a sacrifice, should be a valuable consideration, whereon hee would dispence with the rigor of his commination, and so let fall, or suspend, the penalty of eternal death, in case it had been the chief thing threatned in *Gen.*2.17. as most do hold, and therefore for their sakes I have cited these Instances, though still I think my first expositon of *Gen.*2.17. is found and good, in Chap.2.Sect.3.

CHAP. XI.

SECT. I.

The Examination of Isa.53.4.

Surely he hath born our griefs, and carried our sorrows.

Mr. *Jacob* interprets these sorrows, of Hell sorrows, which Christ bare in our stead, or else we must have born them.

THe Dialogue in pag. 15,16. makes this answer, The Evangelist *Matthew* hath expounded this Text to a quite contrary sense, *Matth.*8.17. *Matthew* saith this Text of *Isaiah* was fulfilled, when Christ took away our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses, from such as were infirm and sick; Not as a Porter bears a burden, by laying them upon his own body, but by bearing them from the sick by his divine power.

Mr. *Norton* in page 35. doth answer to the Dialogue thus: *The Prophet in this Text, by griefs and sorrows, intends sufferings due to us, as it is plain (saith he) from the scope of the Chapter, and the comparing of the fourth and fifth verses, with* 1 Pet.2,24. *and by bearing*

bearing thoſe griefs and ſorrows, he intends Chriſts beating them in our ſtead, &c.

Reply 1. He makes the Reader beleeve, that the ſcope of this Chapter doth ſpeak to this one point, namely, That Chriſt did bear ſuch griefs and ſorrows as are due to us, which in other places he calls the Eſſential torments of Hell, and thence hee infers that this ſpeech in verſe 4. *He hath born our griefs, and carried our ſorrows*, doth intend ſo much; but a judicious Reader may eaſily ſee that the ſcope of this Chapter is to ſet out the operations of the divine nature, as well as of the humane, and of ſeveral other things that belong both to the Perſon and Office of Chriſt; and therefore the ſimple Reader may eaſily bee deceived by telling them thus, That the Prophet in this Text, by griefs and ſorrows, intends ſuch ſufferings by Chriſt as are due to us, namely, Hell-ſorrows, as is plain from the Chapter. Chriſt carried our ſorrows & ſickneſſes away by his Divine power.

2 He tells the Reader that this ſenſe is plain, by comparing of the fourth and fifth verſes with 1 *Pet.*2.24. and thus hee doth winde in the fourth verſe, with the fifth verſe, whereas indeed the fifth verſe only doth anſwer to 1 *Pet.*2.24. and ſo the Dialogue doth parallel it, and explain; and thus hee deceives both himſelf and the Reader, by joyning both theſe verſes together in one ſenſe, which in the Dialogue are handled aſunder in a differing ſenſe; and the Dialogue gives this evident reaſon for it, namely, becauſe the bearing away of our griefs in verſ.4. is expounded by *Matthew* of his bearing away of our infirmities, and diſeaſes, by the power of his God-head; and to this very ſenſe *Matthew* doth tranſlate this verſe of *Iſaiah*, ſaying, *That it might be fulfilled which was ſpoken by* Iſaiah *the Prophet, himſelf took our infirmities, and bare our ſickneſſes*; and beſides, the Prophet himſelf doth confirm this ſenſe in the laſt clauſe of this fourth verſe, ſaying, *Yet we did eſteem him ſtricken, ſmitten of God and afflicted.* The Dialogue doth open this clauſe thus, Though the glory of his God-head did ſhine in our eyes, (by his miraculous bearing away of ſickneſſes and infirmities) yet we eſteemed him but as a groſſe Impoſtor, and therefore put him to death as a vild Malefactor, and then we judged him (that had done ſo many miraculous cures) to be ſtricken, ſmit-

ten of God, and afflicted for his own deserved faults. And thus the Reader may see the true sense of this verse to bee cleered by the context, as well as by *Matthews* translation. But if his bearing our sorrows, had meant that he bare our Hell-sorrows, then the last clause must have run thus, And wee did rightly judge that hee was plagued, and smitten of Gods wrath with Hell-sorrows.

But Mr. *Norton* cuts off this last clause with these words, *The rest* (saith he) *is either impertinent, or uncontroverted*; so that it seems hee makes his last clause to bee impertinent, for it is not uncontroverted.

And now let the judicious Reader judge of his Answer by my Reply.

SECT. II.

But Mr. *Norton* goes on to prove, *That Christ bare our very sorrows, as a Porter bears a burden*, in page 35.

From the collation of the two Hebrew words used in this fourth verse: *For* (saith he) *Though* Nasa, *be hath born, be of more general use, and doth sometimes signifie to bear as a Porter bears a burden, and sometimes otherwise; Yet* (saith he) Sabal, *hee hath carried, signifies properly to bear as one bears a burden; This restraineth the sense of the former word, and limits it to the received interpretation.*

Reply 2. BY this Exposition of *Nasa* with *Sabal*, Mr. *Norton* shews himself to bee a greater Scholar than the Evangelist *Matthew*; *For* (saith he) Sabal *signifieth properly to bear as one bears a burden; and therefore* (saith he) *this restraineth the sense of the former word* Nasa *to the received interpretation*; by this, hee tells the Reader, that *Matthews* interpretation is not the received interpretation, but that Mr. *Nortons* interpretation is the received interpretation. They may receive it that please, *The blind will eat many a flye*, but I hope the Lord will help me to receive *Matthews* interpretation before it.

But secondly, If *Sabal* doth signifie properly to bear as one bears a burden, and doth restrain *Nasa* to the same sense, then it follows, that either Christ took the infirmities from the sick, and

and bare them upon his own body, as a Porter bears a burden, or else that *Matthew* gives a wrong interpretation of *Sabal*: And thus Mr. *Norton* hath put himself into a *Dilemma*, and therefore now hee must either blame his own interpretation to justifie *Matthew*, or else he must still blame *Matthews* interpretation of *Sabal* to justifie his.

3 I conceive that Mr. *Norton* had reasoned more like a Scholar, if hee had said, that though *Sabal* doth ordinarily signifie to carry as a Porter bears a burden, yet sometimes, when it is joyned with *Nasa*, it may signifie lifting up, or bearing away, as *Nasa* doth usually. I am no Linguist, yet with a little help from others, I do sometimes make use of *Kirkerses* Hebrew-Greek Lexicon, and there I see that *Sabal* is twice used with *Nasa* in *Isa.* 46. 4. in a metaphorical sense, for Gods merciful delivering his people from *Babylon* (and a metaphorical sense may bee compared with the litteral in some respects, but yet such comparisons must not alwayes run on four feet) I find also that the Seventy do there render *Sabal* by two differing Greek words, and neither of them do signifie to bear as a Porter bears a burden, and I find they do use it also in other various senses; I find also that *Sabel* of *Sabal* is rendred by our Translators the charge, in taking care for the well-ordering of things, in 1 *King.* 11. 28. See *Ainsw.* in Num. 6. 26.

But suppose that *Nasa* and *Sabal* do signifie that Christ bare our griefs and sorrows, as a Porter bears a burden, as hee did in his affections of compassion; for it is after said, when they brought diseased persons to him, *That he had compassion on them*; and in this respect, hee took our nature with our sinless infirmities, that so hee might bee touched, and might thereby know how to pity us, *Heb.* 2. 17, 18. But this bearing will not serve Mr. *Nortons* turn, it is an amazing kind of bearing which Mr. *Norton* maintains, namely, *That all Christs bodily sufferings were born as Hell-pains*; *For*, saith he, in page 107. *the penal wrath of God, or Hell-pains, were either outward*, viz. *such as hee suffered in body, or inward*, viz. *such as he suffered in soul.* Mr. *Norton* makes all the bodily sufferings of Christ to be Hell-pains.

Reply 3. By this Tenent of his, it necessarily follows, that Christ bare all his outward sufferings, as a Porter bears a burden, from his birth to his death, as Hell-pains.

It is just with God, that he that keeps not close to the Context, when hee doth expound the blessed Scriptures, especially when the sense is already made by conference of one Scripture with another, as *Isaiah* is by the Holy Ghost in *Matthew* (which is a sure rule of true Exposition) that God should leave them to wander after their own vain fantasies.

Sentences of Scripture (saith *Peter Martyr*) must not bee more largely understood, than the place it self wherein they are written may bear, for otherwise, saith he, Wee may bee soon lead into error, in his *Com. pl. part.* 1 *pag.* 208.

It is equally dangerous (saith another Reverend Divine) to add to the truth, and to take from it; yet (saith hee) men do more generally offend in adding to the truth, being naturally inclined to foster those brats which their own fantasies have conceived and brought forth.

CHAP. XII.

SECT. I.

Isa. 53. 5. *Examined.*

He was wounded for our transgressions, bruised for our iniquities. &c.

THese words (saith the Dialogue) do plainly prove that Christ did bear divers wounds, bruises and stripes, for our peace and healing: But the Text doth not say, That hee bare those wounds and bruises from Gods wrath.

Mr. *Norton* answers, true; *But* (yet saith hee) *Christ was wounded not only by Satan, and his instruments; God is the universal Efficient.*

Rep. 1. As to it he speaks to this point, namely, That God is the universal efficient, is to little purpose, except it bee to blind the Reader, to make him beleeve that the Dialogue doth make the Devil to be the universal efficient without Gods appointment; but any one that pleaseth to peruse the Dialogue, may see, that it makes all Christs sufferings to bee from Gods appointment, as the universal efficient: for the Dialogue propounds this Question, *Who did wound him, and bruise him?* and then it makes this answer, *It was Sathan by his Instruments*, according to Gods Prediction in *Gen.* 3. 15. for God said thus to Sathan, Thou Sathan shalt pierce him, thou Sathan shalt put the promised Seed to Death, as a wicked Malefactor, by thy Instruments, the Scribes and Pharisees, and the *Roman* Souldiers; thou shalt peirce his hands and feet, by nayling them to the Crosse, according to the determinate Counsel of God, and in this respect God may bee said to wound him.

Thus farre I have repeated the words of the Dialogue, and now I leave the judicious Reader to judge whether Master *Norton* had any just cause to except against the Dialogue, as if it did not make God to be the universal efficient in all Christs sufferings.

The like flourish he makes against the Dialogue in other points, thereby labouring to make the simple Reader beleeve, That the Dialogue doth hold that which it doth abhor, as in *Pref.* 103. 114. 130, &c. See my Reply in *Cha.* 14. *Repl.* 4. so also in *p.* 40. after he had drawn a false inference from the sense of the Dialogue, then he concludes with this scoff, *Sure you mistake your self in arguing out of this text from the word* Nasa, *against concluding the Doctrin of imputation there-from, because* Nasa *is not in the text.* Master *Norton* doth often wrong the sense of the Dialogue

Repl. 2. The Dialogue doth not say that *Nasa* is in that text of *Es.* 53. 6. but the Dialogue doth frame its Argument from the translated tearm in *Es.* 53. 6. thus; If you will build the common Doctrin of Imputation upon this translated phrase, The Lord hath laid our iniquities upon Christ (as many Interpreters do) then by the same phrase you must affirm, That the Father laid all our iniquities upon himself, by imputing the guilt of our sins to himself, for the Father is said to bear our sins,

Psal. 25. 18. Psal. 32. 1. sins, (in *Psa.* 25. 18. and in *Psa.* 32. 1.) as well as Christ, and *Kirkevers* Hebrew & Greek Concordance tells me, that *Nasa* is in both those places, and in many other places; and Reason tells me, that the tearm of laying any thing upon a mans self, or upon another, is to bear it, and so the tearms, *He hath laid our iniquities upon him*, Es. 53. 6. and *He hath borne our iniquities*, in *Psal.* 32. 1. & *Psal.* 25. 18. & *Exo.* 34. 7. &c. are tearms in English that are Synonima, and therefore the Argument of the Dialogue is sound and good, against such as maintain the Doctrin of imputation from the translated tearm in *Es.* 53. 6. *The Lord hath laid upon him the iniquity of us all*, and I beleeve that any indifferent judicious Reader will judge it so to be.

The like unjust quarrel Mr. *Norton* makes against the Dialogue about the word *Attonement*, for saith he in p. 260. *The Dialogue throughout all its Discourse concerning attonement, seemeth to understand pardon of sin by Attonement; but here* (saith he) *it seemeth by Attonement to understand Reconciliation.*

Rep. 3. What can Mr. *Norton* mean else by this speech, but to make the Reader beleeve, that I did not in all my Discourse concerning Attonement, till now, make reconciliation to bee meant by Attonement? the vanity of this unjust quarrel the Reader may please to see by the words of the Dialogue in the beginning, namely in p. 14. there I explain Attonement by Reconciliation, in these words of the Apostle, in 2 *Cor.* 5. 19. *God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself*, or saith the Dialogue (by way of explanation) *making attonement between the World and himself*; and so in p. 32. I call the Judges Attonement a reconciliation, but I passe over several other such like unjust exceptions, because I will spend my time the more in the substance of the main Controversie.

SECT. II.

The Conclusion of the Dialogue Discourses is this, *That God did not wound Christ as an angry Judge for our sins, but it was for the trial of his Mediatorial obedience, and therefore he is said to learn obedience by the things that he suffered*, Heb. 5. 8.

IT seems that Mr. *Nortons* great exception is at this conclusion, for he answers thus; *Satan and men were Instruments of*

of such a stroke, therefore it is no stroke of Divine vindicative Justice. This (saith he) *is no good Consequent.*

Rep. 4. It seems that Mr. *Norton* by this answer holds, that all and every stroke of any Affliction that Christ suffered from the Devil and his Instruments, was from the revenging Justice of God; and therefore hence it follows, that when the Devil stirred up *Herod* to seek the Childes life (which also did occasion his Parents to carry him into *Ægypt*) it was from Gods Vindicative wrath, although, to prevent it, God in mercy warned *Joseph* to take the Child, and to fly into *Ægypt*.

Master *Norton* makes all the bodily sufferings of Christ to be Hell paines.

It seemeth by Mr. *Nortons* distribution of the Curse, in *Gen.* 2. 17. that he holds this for a firm conclusion, That all the outward afflictions of Christ were from Gods Vindicative wrath, and therefore he calls them the outward penal Torments of Hell, as I formerly noted in Chap. 11.

But yet Mr. *Norton* in the same Page doth acknowledge, That all the afflictions which God inflicteth upon the Elect from the same Curse, are but Chastisements, and not Vindicative punishments, and so that affliction of their flight into *Ægypt* was but a Chastisement to *Joseph* and *Mary*, but it was a Vindicative punishment to Christ: But I would fain know a little more of Mr. *Nortons* skill, how he can call the Afflictions and Punishments which Christ suffered, Hell Torments from Gods Vindicative wrath, seeing the Holy Ghost doth comprehend them all under the word Chastisement, in this very fifth Verse? for the Prophet speaks here of all the greatest Sufferings of Christ, which he indured in that long action of his Passion, from his Apprehension to his Death, I say, all these sufferings hee comprehends under the word Chastisements; but it seems that Mr. *Norton* hath an Art beyond the Holy Ghost to distinguish them from Chastisements, and to rank them under Gods Vindicative Justice; let the Reader judge if he do not undertake to be learned above the Holy Ghost in the sense of the word Chastisement.

The true nature of all Christs greatest Sufferings was Chastisements, therefore they cannot be called the Essential Torments of Hell from Gods vindicative wrath.

The Learned observe that the Hebrew word *Musar*, derived from *Jasar*, doth properly signifie the correction of a Father towards his Son, as all these places do testifie, *Prov.* 3. 11, 12. *Prov.* 19. 18. *Deut.* 8. 5. *Psal.* 94. 12. *Jer.* 31. 18. and in *Heb.* 5. 6. the Apostle doth concur with the Prophet *Isaiah*, That the true

Heb. 5. 6

nature of all Christs Sufferings were but Chastisements, for he saith thus, Though he were the Son, yet learned he obedience by the things he suffered; his learning of obedience is the subjection of a Son to his Fathers chastisement, and therefore it follows necessarily, That seeing all his Sufferings were but Chastisements, they were not inflicted on him from Gods Vindicative wrath, and I beleeve that this is a sound truth, that will hold water if the Scripture hold.

Secondly, It is further evident that the Sufferings of Christ are farre from being inflicted on him from Gods Vindicative wrath; because all his sufferings, and all the sufferings of the Saints are founded alike in Gods fatherly love, and in that respect there is a reciprocal communion between Christ the Head and all his members, in all their sufferings.

1 The Elect do partake with Christ in all his sufferings, I mean in respect of the kinde of them, as these Scriptures do testifie, *Phil.* 3. 10, 11. 2 *Tim.* 2. 11. *Col.* 1. 24. 1 *Pet.* 4. 13. 1 *Pet.* 2. 21. *Rom.* 6. 2 *Cor.* 1. 5. *Mat.* 10. 39. *Luk.* 22. 28. and therefore hence it follows necessarily, that if the sufferings of Christ were from Gods Vindicative wrath, that then all the sufferings of the Elect must likewise be from Gods Vindicative wrath, seeing they do communicate with Christ in the kinde of his sufferings.

Secondly, These Scriptures do testifie that Christ the Head doth communicate with all his Members in all their sufferings, *Heb.* 2. 18. *Heb.* 4. 15. *Es.* 63. 1, 2. And hence it doth necessarily follow, that if all the Sufferings of the Members of Christ bee but Chastisements, then the Sufferings of Christ must not be ranked in any other form of Justice but where Gods Chastisements are.

Thirdly, It is evident, that all the Sufferings of Christ are called but temptations of Trial, *Heb.* 2, 18. *Heb.* 4. 15. and Christ himself at the upshot of his life doth call all his former Afflictions but such temptations of Trial, wherein his Apostles had been sharers with him, *Luk.* 22. 28. and therefore it doth hence follow, that they were not inflicted on him from Gods Vindicative wrath, unlesse M. *Norton* wil prove that the Apostles also did suffer Gods Vindicative wrath, which in another place he seems to deny.

SECT.

SECT. III.

But it may be some will here object, That though Christs Sufferings were but Chastisements, yet they were inflicted on him from Gods Wrath, for even Gods Fatherly Chastisements are inflicted from his wrath, 2 Sam. 24. 1. therefore if Christ did partake with his people but in their kinde of punishments, his suffering must also be from Gods wrath.

Reply 5. IT doth not follow, for Christ might truly partake with them in their punishments, in respect of sense and feeling, and yet from a differing cause, and for a differing end, as for example, The godly may suffer wounds in their body for sin inherent, in a judicial way both from God and Superiours, and Christ also may suffer such like wounds, and yet not in a judicial way from sin imputed, but as a voluntary Combater with Sathan and his Instruments, for the winning of the Prize, even for the Redemption of the Elect and all this without any wrath from the voluntary Covenanters and Masters of the Prize; and in this sense only Christ did suffer wounds and bruises, namely as a voluntary Combater, for in *Gen.* 3. 15. God declared his Decree, that he would put an utter enmity between Sathan and the Seed of the deceived Woman, and that the Devil should have full liberty to wound Christ, and to bruise him, and to peirce him as a Malefactor in the foot-soals, and to do what he could to disturbe his patience, and so to hinder his death from being a Sacrifice; but because Christ continued obedient to the death, even to the ignominious and painful death of the Crosse, and at last made his Soul a Sacrifice, he overcame Principalities and Powers in it, namely in the manner of his death on the Crosse, so that the cause of Christs Wounds was not from Gods judicial imputation of our sin and guilt, nor from Gods judicial wrath, but from his undertaking to be a voluntary Combater with Sathan, for the breaking of his Head-plot by his constant obedience, even to the death of the Crosse for mans Redemption; so that the sufferings of Christ do arise from a differing cause, and are for a differing end from the sufferings of the Sa-

Christs Sufferings may justly be called punishments, such as the godly suffer, and yet not from Gods wrath, as theirs is.

and so consequently not from Gods wrath, as theirs is; But I shall inlarge this point in the end of this Chapter, and often elsewhere, because it hath an undeniable foundation of truth in *Gen.* 3. 15. and all the Prophets do but comment upon that declared Decree of God.

SECT. IV.

But saith Mr. *Norton*, pag. 38.

The sufferings of Christ included in this text, are not only such wherein Satan and men were instruments: But some of them (saith he) were immediately inflicted of God, without any second means as instruments thereof; Hence we read of a wounded spirit, Prov. 18.4. *A wounded conscience,* 1 Cor. 8.12. *A broken and a bruised heart,* Luke 4.18. *The plague of the heart,* 1 King. 8.38.

None of Christs sufferings were inflicted on him from Gods immediate wrath.

Reply 6. A judicious Reader may well smile at the unsuitableness of these proofs to his Proposition: In his Proposition hee saith, That some of Christs sufferings were inflicted immediately of God without any second means as instruments thereof: But any judicious Reader may soon see, that a wounded spirit, a wounded conscience, &c. do come to bee so wounded by second means, namely, by the sight of sin, and the desert of sin: But suppose that God doth in some cases inflict punishments immediately on some mens souls, by his supreme power, without respect of sin, yet that doth not answer to the Proposition of the Dialogue, for the Dialogue doth not speak of mens souls, but of Christs soul. The Dialogue saith, That Christs soul is not capable of bearing wounds from Gods immediate wrath: But all Mr. *Nortons* proofs are of mens souls that are sinners.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 38. *Satan being a spirit may have access unto, and consequently both may, and doth afflict the spirit,* 1 Cor. 5.5. Eph. 2.12.16.

Reply 7. What though Sathan may afflict the spirit of a sinner, yet still that doth not prove his Proposition which hee un-

undertook to make good, namely, That God from his immediate wrath did afflict the spirit of Christ.

But saith Mr. *Norton*, *If Sathan cannot, yet God can.*

Reply 8. What God can do is one thing, and what God did to the soul of Christ is another thing; But still his Proposition to be proved is, *That God did inflict his immediate wrath upon the soul of Christ without any second means.*

2 For a more full answer to both the former speeches of Mr. *Norton*, I shall refer you to Mr. *Thomas Goodwin*; hee saith that the soul of *Adam* in his innocency, and the soul of Christ were privileged from all inward suggestions from Sathan, and that Sathan could tempt them no otherwise but by his outward temptations only; And I find other Divines to accord with him. In his Child of Light p.52, 53.120.

3 He sheweth also, that God doth not torment the souls of the damned by his immediate wrath, but by second means; For (saith hee) though God is to be feared, because hee only can cast both body and soul into hell; Yet (saith hee) this is not meant as if God were the immediate Tormentor of souls after the great day, seeing they are to bee tormented by that fire which God hath prepared in common for them and the Devils.

4 *P. Martyr* (in his *Com. pl. part. 4. pag. 314.*) saith, It is the property of God to command, and not to execute things commanded; And saith *Baxter* in his *Saints Rest*, page 275. God afflicts mens souls, not immediately, but by instruments.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 39.

Christ suffered not only in body, but in soul, Isa.53.10. When thou shalt make his soul a sacrifice for sin; My soul is exceeding sorrowful to the death, *Mat.26.38. Mar.14.34. His great heavinesse, sore amazement, agony, sweat as it were drops of blood*, Mar.14.33. Luke 22.44. *cannot bee looked at in a person that was God and man, as less than the effects of Soul-sorrows, Hell-sorrows*, Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hell. Mat.26.38. Luke 22.44.

Reply 9. I have shewed in Chap. 17. Sect. 3. and in Chap. 16. Sect. 3. That the soul of Christ in these places quoted by Mr. *Norton*, are meant of his vital soul, and not of his immortal soul.

2 That Christ himself was his own Afflicter with soul-sorrows, Chap. 16. Sect. 2. and Chap. 17. Sect. 4. Reply 15.

3 When all these cited Scriptures are put together, they prove no more but this, that Christ suffered much in his soul, as well as in his body; But where doth any of them say, That his soul-sufferings were inflicted on him from Gods immediate wrath, without any second means? which is the very point that Mr. *Norton* undertook to make good.

But saith hee, *His great heavinesse, sore amazement, and sweat, as it were great drops of blood, cannot bee looked at in a person that was both God and man, as lesse than the effects of Hell-sorrows, &c.*

Christs humane nature was often purposely left of the divine nature, that so it might be touched with the sense of our infirmities more than ours can be.

Reply 10. Doth not Mr. *Norton* hold forth in these words that the humane nature of Christ was a true part of his divine person? why else doth he say, That his great heavinesse, sore amazement, &c. cannot be looked at in a person that was God and man, as lesse than the effects of Hell-sorrows? as if Christs humane nature was not able to bear these sorrows, without the powerful assistance of his divine nature: It seems to mee, he thinks that his Godhead by vertue of personal union did alwaies co-operate to the assisting of his humane nature to undergo his soul-sorrows, as our bodies are holpen to bear our sufferings by our souls, by reason of personal union: But I shall joyn with those Divines that reason contrary; for both ancient and latter Divines do often say, That his divine nature did often rest, that so his humane nature might bee touched with the feeling of our infirmities; and this the divine nature might do, because the humane nature was no true part of his divine person (as our souls are to make our bodies a person) but an Appendix only: The union of his humane nature to his divine person, was such an ineffable union, that it cannot bee exemplified by any other union whatsoever: Indeed, if his humane

manie nature had beena true part of his divine perſon, as our ſouls are of our perſons, then it muſt have holpen his humane nature to bear his ſorrows; but I think it is no leſſe than hereſie to hold ſo; but becauſe it was but an Appendix to his divine perſon, therefore the divine nature could put out his power to leave the humane nature to its ſelf, and to its own qualifications, to bee touched to the utmoſt with the ſenſible feeling of our infirmities; and therefore I ſay, That the perfections of his humane nature, and the unction of the holy Spirit at his inſtalment was ſufficient to ſupport him, and to regulate his ſoul-ſorrows, without the co-operation of his divine nature; and doubtleſſe, as his humane nature was moſt perfect in ſpirits, ſo it was to the utmoſt touched with the ſenſe of our infirmities, much more then our corrupt natures can bee. But I ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak more of this in the Paſſion of Chriſt; and in reſpect of his ineffable union, his divine nature did leave his humane nature to act in his moral obedience, and natural actions.

But ſaith Mr. *Norton* in page 39.

The Curſe is not only bodily, but ſpiritual, as wee were delivered from our ſin, ſo bee bare our ſin; But wee were delivered not only from the bodily, but alſo from the ſpiritual puniſhment of ſin. Therefore, &c.

Reply 11. I ſuppoſe that Mr. *Norton* by this ſpeech, *Wee were delivered from the ſpiritual puniſhment of ſin*, doth mean that Chriſt hath delivered us from the ſpiritual death of Hell.

But I have ſhewed in Chap. 2. in Sect. 3. That the firſt death threatned to *Adam* and his poſterity, in caſe hee did eat of the forbidden fruit, was a ſpiritual death in ſin; and that bodily death, and eternal death was threatned after this as a juſt puniſhment for *Adams* death in ſin; and hence I reaſon thus: That ſeeing Chriſt hath delivered us from our firſt ſpiritual death in ſin, without bearing it in kind, and from our bodily diſeaſes, in *Mat.* 8. without bearing them in kind, hee may as well deliver us from our ſpritual and eternal death in hell, without bearing it in kind.

But

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 40.

Whilst you so often affirm, that obedience of Christ to be meritorious, and yet all along deny it to bee performed in a way of justice, you so often affirm a contradiction; the very nature of merit including justice; for merit is a just desert, or a desert in way of justice.

The true nature of merit, and how Christ did merit our Redemption.

Reply 12. The way of justice is either the way of vindicative justice, or else it is the way of justice according to the voluntary Covenant. The Dialogue indeed doth oppose the way of vindicative justice; but yet it makes all Christs sufferings to be performed in a way of justice, according to the order of justice in the voluntary Cause and Covenant; but it is no marvel that Mr. *Norton* cannot see into this ground-word of merit, because he is so much prejudiced against the Dialogue scope, or else he could not have said, that it affirms a contradiction: Indeed I should have affirmed a contradiction, if I had at any time affirmed as Mr. *Norton* doth, that the meritorious cause of all Christs sufferings and death, was from Gods judicial imputing our sins to Christ.

But the Dialogue goes another way to work, it shews from Gods declaration in *Gen.*3.15. That the Devil must combate against the seed of the deceived woman, and that Christ in his humane nature, must combate against him, and break his Head-plot, by continuing obedient to the death, and that therefore his sufferings and death were meritorious, because it was all performed in a way of justice, namely, in exact obedience to all the Articles of the voluntary Covenant, as I have shewed also in Chap.10.

And it is out of all doubt that the Articles of the Eternal Covenant for mans Redemption are comprised in that declaration of our Redemption in *Gen.*3.15.

1 God doth there declare by way of threatning to Sathan (doubtlesse in the hearing of *Adam*, and for his instruction) that he would put an enmity between him and the woman, and between the devils seed and her seed (hee shall enter the Lists, and try Masteries with thee) and hee shall break thy Head-plot (and to this conflict doth the word Agony agree in

in *Luke* 22.44.) And Thou Satham shalt bear an utter enmity against him; and thou shalt have liberty to enter the lists with this seed of the deceived woman, and have liberty to do what thou canst to pervert his obedience, as thou haddest to pervert the obedience of *Adam*, and in case thou canst disturb his patience by ignominious contumelies, or by the torture of a painful death, and so pervert him in his obedience, then thou shalt by that means hinder this seed of the woman from making his soul a sacrifice, and so from the breaking of thy Head-plot, and so from winning the prize, and therefore thou shalt have free liberty to tempt him to sin as much as thou canst, and thou shalt have liberty to impute as many sinful crimes against him as thou canst devise, and so to put him to an ignominious and painful death, like to wicked malefactors.

But in case he shall continue patient without disturbance, and continue obedient to the death, without any diversion, and at last make his death an obedient sacrifice by his own Priestly power, then I will accept his death and sacrifice as full satisfaction for the sins of the Elect, and so hee shall break thy Head-plot, and win the prize, which is the salvation of all the Elect; and doubtless this death and sacrifice of Christ was exemplified to *Adam* by the sacrifice of some Lamb, presently after his Fall.

Lo, here is a true description of Christs merit, according to the order of justice, as it was agreed on, in the voluntary Covenant; For wee may gather from the threatning, First, That there was such a voluntary Covenant. Secondly, That Christ did covenant to continue constant in his obedience through all his temptations and trials. And thirdly, that upon the performance thereof, God would reward him with the salvation of all the Elect, *Pbi.*2.9,10,11. *Ef.*5310 &c.

Mr. *Watson De Reconciliatione peccatoris, part.* 1. *cap.*4. doth thus explain the meritorious cause.

That the meritorious cause of Reconciliation (saith hee) is a kind of efficient, there needs no other proof, then that it binds as it were the principal efficient, to perform that which upon the merit is due; As if a man in running a race, or the like, so runneth as the order of the Game requireth, by so doing, hee meriteth the prize or reward, and thereby also hee

bindeth the Master of the Game to pay him that which he hath deserved.

This is a true description of the true nature of Christs merit according to the order of justice, in the voluntary Covenant, better and more agreeable to the Scripture than Mr. *Norton's* is from the legal order of Court-justice, by a legal imputation of sin; for the Scripture is silent in this way, and plain in the other way.

And from this description of merit from the voluntary cause and Covenant, These Conclusions do follow.

1 That the wounds, bruises, and blood-shed of such as did win the prize, cannot be said to be inflicted upon them from the vindicative wrath of the Masters of the Game, caused through the imputation of sin, and guilt against their Laws; for none can win the prize that is guilty of any such transgression against their Law, as the Apostle doth witnesse in 2 *Tim.* 2. 5. and peruse also Dr. *Hammonds* Annotations on 1 *Cor.* 9. 24. and on *Heb.* 12. 1, 2. and on 2 *Tim.* 4. 8. and take notice, that the Greek in 2 *Tim.* 4. 7. is the same by which the Seventy translate *Gen.* 30. 8. *With excellent wrastlings have I wrastled*, namely, for the mastery and victory; and so also our larger Annotations on 2 *Tim.* 4. 8.

Imputation of sin in the voluntary combate doth lose the prize.

2 Hence it follows, That the said wounds, bruises, and blood-shed, ought not to bee accounted as any vindicative punishments from the Masters of the prize, but as voluntary trials of their man-hood, of their patience, and obedience to their Laws.

Punishments may be suffered without the imputation of sin.

3 Hence it follows, That the wounds and bruises mentioned in *Isa.* 53. 5. 10. &c. which Christ suffered, were no other but the very same that God had declared hee should suffer from Sathan, in *Gen.* 3. 15. I confess that the Hebrew word for bruised or pierced in *Gen.* 3. 15. is different from the Hebrew word in *Isa.* 59. 5. 10. but yet in both places, it is plainly spoken of the bruising of Christ by Sathan and his instruments; *Isaiah* saith, *He was wounded and bruised for our transgressions*, namely, by Sathan at Gods appointment, and because Christ did voluntarily undertake this combate with Sathan, therefore God did also covenant that his bruises should bee for the chastisement of our peace, and for our healing; And so in verse 10. *It pleased the Lord to bruise*

God did wound and bruise Christ no otherwise, but as hee gave Sathan leave to do his worst unto Christ.

bruise him, and to put him to grief, namely, according to Gods prediction in *Gen.* 3.15. but God did not bruise him by his immediate wrath, hee was not prest under the sense of Gods wrath; as Mr. *Norton* affirms, for to bee prested under the sense of Gods wrath, is to bee forced to suffer by violence.

Job did acknowledge, when the Devil destroyed his cattel and children, that it was the Lord that took these things from him, *Job* 1.21. and saith, when the Devil smote him full of boyls, *The hand of the Lord hath touched me*, Job 19.1. and yet it was Sathan that did smite him with boyls, *Job* 2.7. So God is said by *Isaiah*, *To delight to bruise Christ, and to put him to grief*, because God delivered Christ into the hands of the Devils Instruments to combate for the victory, *Act.* 2. 23. and so it is said, *That God spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all*, namely, to Sathan and his Instruments to combate with him, *Rom.* 8.32. And so in like sort, God is said, *To give power to Pilate to condemn Christ*, Joh. 19.11. And so God delivered him into the hands of sinners, *Matth.* 27.45. to do unto him whatsoever the counsel of God had determined, *Act.* 4.28. And his Father gave him the cup of all these afflictions, *Joh.* 18.11. because hee declared that Sathan should have this liberty and power, *Gen.* 3.15.

Yea Christ delivered himself into the hands of sinners, *Joh.* 18.4.8. And Christ did often foretel his sufferings to his Disciples, saying, *Behold we go up to Jerusalem, and the Son of man shall be delivered unto the chief Priests, and unto the Scribes, and they shall condemn him unto death, and shall deliver him unto the Gentiles, and they shall mock him, and scourge him, and spit upon him, and shall kill him*, *Mat.* 16.21. *Mar.* 10.33,34. *Luk.* 18.31,32,33. *Luk.* 24.7.25,26, 44,46. *Act.* 13.27,28,29. And all this Christ did undergo from the voluntary Cause and Covenant, as it was declared in *Gen.* 3.15. and therefore not from Gods wrath.

4 This doth clearly exemplifie, how, and in what respect the obedience of Christ in all his sufferings was meritorious.

5 This doth also clearly exemplifie, how all the sufferings of Christ may be called punishments, without the judicial Imputation of our sins to him by God.

6 This also doth exemplifie, how God is said to bee just to sinners, in 1 *Joh.* 1. 9. *Rom.* 3. 26. namely, because hee had from all eternity covenanted with Christ the Mediator, that upon the performance of his combate with Sathan, according to the Laws of the combate, that then hee should thereby obtain his reconciliation to beleeving sinners; As soon therefore as Christ had performed this combate, and made his soul a sacrifice, according to the eternal Covenant, God is said to *declare his righteousnes in remitting their sins, that so he might be just, and the justifier of him that beleeveth in Jesus*, Rom. 3. 26.

But still Mr. *Norton* objecteth in page 41. thus: *Had Christ suffered death without sin imputed, his death could not have been called a punishment.*

Reply 13. In the former description of punishment suffered from the voluntary Cause and Covenant, hee may see an instance to the contrary.

But Mr. *Norton* saith in page 140.

Though the notions of a Mediator, and a Malefactor, are clearly distinct in themselves; yet your distinguishing between Christs dying as a Mediator, and as a Malefactor, is unsound.

Reply 14. Though it bee unsound in Mr. *Nortons* sense, yet it is not unsound in the Scripture sense; let the former Scripture in *Gen.* 3. 15. be judge in the case.

1 He must dye as a Malefactor, for God had armed Sathan with authority to use him as a vile Malefactor, and to crucifie him in the Foot-soale.

And yet 2 As soon as Christ had finished all those sufferings in obedience to the Laws of the combate, he must make his soul a sacrifice of Reconciliation (taught by the death of some Lamb) by his Priestly power, even by the joynt concurrence of both his natures, or else he could not have been the Mediator of the New Testament, through death, if hee had not (as soon as hee had finished all his sufferings) offered his vital soul for a sacrifice by his eternal Spirit; both his natures did con-

cur

cur to make his death a sacrifice, and in that respect only hee was the Mediator of the New Testament through that kind of death; As the Apostles argument lyes in *Heb.* 9.14,15,16. And thus the Dialogue doth make the notions of a Malefactor, and a Mediator, to bee clearly distinct.

7 Hence it is evident that all the outward sufferings of Christ, were from the voluntary Cause and Covenant in entring the Lists with Sathan (not in the power of his God-head, but) in his humane nature which he received from the seed of the deceived woman, and as it was accompanied with our infirmities: And in this respect he is said by *Isaiah, to be wounded or tormented for our transgressions, and to bee bruised for our iniquities.* And thus *Peter* must bee understood, when he saith, *He bare our sins in his body on the Tree*; that is to say, Our punishments in his combate with Sathan, 1 *Pet.*2.24. And thus Christ was oppressed by his Combater Sathan, *Isa.*53.7. when hee suffered himself to bee apprehended by a band of armed Souldiers, and to bee bound as a prisoner, and as a Malefactor: and in this sense Christ saith *I am the good Shepherd that giveth his life for his sheep*, Joh.10.11. I will readily venture my life in the combate with that roaring Lion Sathan for the redemption of my sheep; And thus *Moses* did offer his life to redeem the lives of the Israelites when they had forfeited their lives into the hands of Gods justice, by worshipping the Golden Calf, *Exod.*32. *Then Moses said, I will now go up to the Lord, peradventure I shall make Attonement for your sins, and he said to God, If thou wilt forgive their sin, and if not* (but that they must still dye) *blot me I pray thee out of thy book which thou hast written*, called the Book of the living, *Ps.*69.29. and called also the Writing of the house of *Israel*, Eze.13.9.) And herein *Moses* (saith *Ainsworth*) dealt as a Mediator, between God and men, and was a figure of our Mediator Christ, who laid down his life for his sheep, *Joh.*10.15. and redeemed us from the curse of the Law, when hee was made a curse for us, *Gal.*3.13. The Intent of *Moses*, say the Hebrew Doctors was, That hee might dye instead of them, and bear their iniquity according to that in *Isa.*53.5. *He was wounded for our Trespasses*: For (say the Hebrew Doctors) The death of the just maketh Reconciliation. See *Ainsw.* in *Exod.*32.32. But in case *Moses* had been made guilty of their sin by Gods imputation, doubtless hee had

1 Pet.2.24.

Es.53.7.

Ex.32.32.

had not been a fit person to offer his life as a Mediator for their lives. This resemblance, I grant, is but very weak, because *Moses* did not offer to give his life as a Mediator for them, by a mutual Covenant, but of his own head, and therefore his offer was refused; yet that speech of the Hebrew Doctors, The death of the just maketh Reconciliation, may somewhat inlighten touching that place in 1 Pet. 3. 18. where it is said, *That Christ suffered, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God*; for hee being just in Gods sight, ingaged himself, according to a mutual and reciprocal Covenant, to enter the Lists with Sathan, and to continue just through all the malicious designs of Sathan, even to the death of the Crosse, that so at last hee might make his soul a sacrifice of Atonement, and so bring us to God. Mark this, hee is called the just in all his sufferings: But hee was not so called in the Jews account, for they put him to death as a sinful Malefactor. Neither could hee bee said to be absolutely just in the sight of God, in case God had imputed the guilt of our sins to him in a formal legal way: But saith *Peter*, *The just suffered for the unjust*, hee that knew himself to be every way just in the sight of God, and of his Law, hee entred the Lists, and suffered from Sathans enmity, and yet still he continued obedient to the death, and so continued to bee just. And hence wee may see wherein the efficacy of Christs sufferings do consist, namely, in this, because in all his conflict with Sathan, his patience was not disturbed, nor his obedience perverted, but to the very last, hee approved himself to bee most just and righteous in the sight of God, and therefore hee conquered Sathan by righteousnesse (as the ancient Divines do very often speak) because he strove lawfully, according to the order agreed on by the voluntary Covenanters; And so hee won the prize.

1 Pet. 3. 18.

All Christs sufferings were without any imputation of sin from God, and therefore he was accepted, and so his obedience to the death doth bring us to God.

2 In his combate with Sathan, his obedience was eminent, above the obedience of any condemned delinquent that patiently submits his life to bee taken away by justice, because hee put forth a voluntary act of compliance in all his combating with Sathan, and in all his sufferings, that so hee might please him that had chosen him to bee the Captain of our salvation; and in that respect his chastisements which hee suffered from Sathans malice to provoke him to some sinful distemper, are

said

said to bee for our peace and healing (by obtaining a reconciliation for us) and so he doth heal us, and bring us to God; and so say the Hebrew Doctors, The death of the Just maketh Reconciliation.

It is no evill in it self to bee punished from a voluntary undertaking of a combate, but to bee punished in a legal way, through a legal imputation of sin and guilt, that is a true evill indeed.

Christ was voluntary in complying with all his sufferings, or else they had not been meritorious. See also Ch. 6

3 Take notice in some particulars how eminently active Christ was in his sufferings as a voluntary Combater.

1 He was lead by the Spirit, that lighted on him at his Baptism, into the Wildernesse, as soon as ever hee was extrinsecally installed into the Mediators office, on purpose to try Masteries with the Devils temptations (which no man else in the world might presume to do, but this Captain of our salvation) and in this respect all his sufferings may more fitly bee called active sufferings, or active passive obedience, rather than passive obedience, for he put forth a ready and voluntary compliance with them, and that by way of anticipation, according to Covenant, as a voluntary undertaker of the combate for our Redemption; and this kind of obedience in his sufferings, made his chastisements to be meritorious for our peace, and for our healing, as the Dialogue shews in p. 49.

2 Take another instance of Christs voluntary obedience, in entring into the Lists with Sathan as the Captain of our salvation, in all that long businesse that is called his Passion.

1 He manifested himself to bee continually mindful of that hour that God had appointed to bee for his apprehension and death, *Luke* 12.50. *Joh.* 12.23,27.&c. *Joh.* 13.1. and in verse 2,3. Supper being ended, and Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hand, namely, to order himself in every circumstance of his sufferings, in his combate with Sathan, according to the Articles of the Eternal Covenant (for the Text saith, *That he knew from the beginning who it was that should betray him.* Joh. 6.64. Joh. 13.11.) therefore hee was active, and provoked *Judas* at Supper to go out, saying unto him, *What thou doest, do quickly,* Joh. 13.27. and then saith hee, *The Son of man goeth as it is determined* (namely by a mutual Covenant) *Luke*

22.

22.22. and then said he, *The Prince of this world cometh* (to incounter with mee, with more armed violence than formerly) but saith hee, *Hee hath nothing in me*, Joh.14.30. hee hath no just ground to accuse mee for breaking the Laws of the combate, and therefore hee cannot hinder me from winning the prize; and when Christ arose to go to the Garden, where hee knew hee must bee apprehended, he said thus to his Disciples, *As my Father gave me a Commandement* (or Appointment) *so I do; Arise, let us go hence*, Joh.14.31. It is my Fathers appointment, and it is my Covenant that I should now arise to meet these armed Arch-Instruments of Sathan. And when *Judas* and the Souldiers came to apprehend him, hee said to the chief Priests, *This is your hour, and the power of darknesse* (you have full liberty to do your worst against me) *Luke* 22.53. And when *Peter* went about to protect him from their power by his sword, hee would not bee protected from Sathans power, and therefore hee bid him to put up his sword; for said hee, *If I had a mind to be protected from their power, I could pray to my Father, and he would give me more than twelve Legions of Angels; But how then* (said he) *shall the Scriptures be fulfilled*, that say, *Thus it must be*? Matth.26.53,54. for the Scriptures say, *That I must be pierced as a Malefactor in the Foot-soals*, Gen.3.15. and so likewise in the hands, *Psal.*22.16. And that I must bee oppressed by a band of armed Souldiers, Isa.53.7. Joh.18.3.12. and brought as a Lamb to the slaughter, *Isa.*53.7. And when hee came to his Answer, hee doth not so much as plead for himself, either before the High-Priest, *Mat.*26.63. or afterwards before *Pilate*, Mat.27.12,14. *But as a sheep before her shearer is dumb, so he opened not his mouth.* And because it was the appointed hour of the power of the Prince of darknesse, to exercise his utmost force against him, therefore hee did not like a faint-hearted Souldier, withdraw himself from them into some unknown place, but he purposely went into a known Garden where hee knew hee must bee apprehended by Sathans Arch-Instruments (and be lead by them as a sheep to the slaughter) *Joh.*18.1. And then because he knew all things, and what should befal him, he went forth, *Joh.*18.4. namely to meet the Devils Instruments that came to apprehend him, *Joh.*18.6. And as soon as hee had but said unto them, *I am Hee* (that must break the Devils Head-plot by my constant patience and obedience) they

they all fell to the ground at his word speaking, and here hee kept them, for his Disciples sake, untill they might have liberty to depart; and if hee would hee might have departed as well as they, but instead of departing, he put forth another act of his divine power to raise them up again, that so hee might bee active in delivering himself unto their power, to bee apprehended, and to bee bound as a Malefactor, and so to be carried before the Elders of the people; And thus hee was active to drink of the bitter Cup that his Father had given him, for hee had said but a little before unto *Peter*, *Put up thy sword* (and protect me not against these furies of Sathan) *shall I not drink of the Cup that my Father hath given me?* namely, by his appointment, and by mine own agreement from eternity.

By these, and such like passages, it is evident, that Christ was eminently voluntary and active in all his sufferings and combatings with Sathan, as a good Shepherd that doth readily venture his life against the Lion and the Bear for the safety of his sheep, he suffered nothing by constraint from his Fathers wrath, through his judicial imputation of our sins, being pressed under the sense of the wrath of God, as Mr. *Nortons* terms are, but God was pleased to let Sathan loose, to oppresse him, to wound, and to bruise him, and to put him to as much grief as hee could, to disturb his patience, and to pervert him in the course of his obedience, when his soul should make it self an offering, that so hee might prevent his sacrifice, by which means only, it was decreed that the Devils Head-plot must be broken.

Conclusion.

Hence it follows, that seeing the Devil could not, neither by his fraudulent temptations in the Wilderness, nor yet by his temptations of force in the Garden, and on the Crosse, provoke him to any impatience, or to any disobedience, by his ignominious tortures, when his soul should make an offering, but that still hee continued constant in his obedience, and at last did make his soul a sacrifice by his own Priestly power, according to the Laws of the voluntary Covenant; his death and sufferings must needs bee meritorious for the obtaining of Gods Reconciliation, and mans Redemption from Sathans Head-plot.

CHAP. XIII.

The Examination of Isa. 53. 6.

The Lord hath laid upon him the Iniquities of us all.

THe Exposition given by the Dialogue of this translated term [*The Lord hath laid upon*] is sound and good Divinity, and not confuted by Mr. *Nortons* Answer, hee cannot hence mantain the point of imputing our sins to Christ, which is the main thing controverted, and which I have already replied unto in Ch. 7.

But because I received some Animadversions from a Reverend Divine that gave another Translation than formerly I followed, and from thence he also gave another differing Exposition from mine, by means whereof I was put to a stand for a time, though after serious seeking unto God by prayer, conference, reading, and meditation upon the Context, I came at last to a more cleer apprehension of the meaning of the words, to my satisfaction; for upon the said search, I could not find that the Prophet in this Text did speak of *Gods judicial imputing* our sins to Christ, or that it spake any thing directly of Gods judicial inflicting our deserved penalties (namely Hell torments) upon Christ, because no verse either before or after this verse, did conclude any such thing; and therefore upon serious consideration, I durst not take this verse in that sense.

I confesse I am no Linguist, yet I love sometimes to search into *Kirkeroes* Hebrew-Greek Lexicon, to see in how many various senses the Seventy do render the Hebrew words; and sometimes in more difficult cases, I love to confer with such as are learned in the Tongues. And by this means I find that the Hebrew word *Pagah* in this verse doth signifie to *Meet*, and because it is in the conjugation *Hiphil*, it doth signifie

to

to *Cause to meet*; so then the words must run thus, *The Lord caused him to meet*, namely, the Father caused the Mediator to meet, to consult the way of fallen mans Redemption from Sathans Head-plot; and in that meeting all the Trinity were equal Counsellors and Covenanters; but the Father is said to make or cause the meeting, because he is first in order, yet because there is but one will in the Trinity, therefore in *Jer.* 30 21. the Father saith thus in commendation of Christ, *Who is this that (hath) ingaged his heart to approach unto me, saith the Lord?* Now hence it may fitly bee demanded how Christ did ingage his heart? the answer is, that he did it by way of Contract or Covenant; and therefore the Hebrew word *Guarab*, which wee translate ingaged, doth properly signifie no more but a conjunction or joyning together, but in this place it relates to the conjunction of the Father and the Son in a Covenant for mans Redemption, and accordingly it is sometimes put for a conjunction of persons in a league or confederation, as I have shewed at large in my Treatise of *Holy Time.* Jer. 30. 21.

But thus the whole verse in *Jeremy* may bee read and paraphrased, *His excellent one shall bee of himself, and his Ruler shall go forth from the midst of him, and I will cause him to draw neer*, namely, as a Priest, with an acceptable sacrifice; for this Hebrew word is used in *Lev.* 1. 2. for offering an oblation, or bringing neer a gift; so then to bring neer, or approach neer unto God, is to offer unto him, and to offer a sacrifice for sin, is to make Attonement: See *Ainsw.* in *Lev.* 6. 26. and therefore one of these is used for another, as in 1 *Chron.* 16. 1. they brought neer burnt offerings; for which in 2 *Sam.* 6. 17. is written, *David* offered burnt offerings; so in *Numb.* 6. 14, 16, 17. *The Nazarite shall bring neer his oblation, and the Priest shall bring them neer*, that is, both the Nazarite and his sacrifice: And saith God of Christ, *I will cause him to draw neer, and approach unto me; for who is this that hath ingaged his heart, or conjoyned himself with me in a Covenant to do my will for mans Redemption?* And in answer to this Covenant, Christ saith, *In burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin, thou hast had no pleasure, then said I, Lo I come to do thy will, O God, thy Law is in my heart*, Psal. 40. 8. *Heb.* 10. and saith *Ainsworth* in *Psal.* 148. 14. Christ draweth neer unto God for his people, and there hee Psal. 40. 8.

citeth this Text of *Jer.*30.21. and so also through Christs sacrifice wee have boldnesse to draw nigh to God, *Heb.*7.19. *Heb.*10.22.

2 As these words (*He caused him to meet*) may bee applied to the meeting of the Trinity, for the constituting of the eternal Covenant, so they may bee applied also in speech of the execution of the said eternal Covenant, when Christ met his Father with his sacrifice of Attonement, and then the words must go thus, *The Father made or constituted Him*, namely, *his Son, to meet him as a Priestly Mediator, with his appointed sacrifice of his vital soul, to attone his wrath for the iniquities of us all, that by nature had gone astray like lost sheep*, as it is expressed in the beginning of the verse.

And thus this meeting may bee understood both of the eternal Council and Covenant of the Trinity, and also of the execution of it.

3 The Learned say, that the Hebrew word *Pagah* in the conjugation *Hiphil*, comes no more but six times in the Old Testament, namely, in *Isa.*53.6. *Isa.*53.12. *Isa.*59.16. *Jer.*15.11. *Jer.* 36.25. *Job* 36.32.

Now the last five places are rendred both by *Tremelius*, and by our English Translations, for such a meeting, as is by way of mediation, intreaty, or intercession.

Though properly the Hebrew word signifies no more but to make to meet, or to appoint some persons to meet for several ends; but yet in the said five places it is applied to a meeting by way of intercession: As for example, in *Isa.*53.12. Hee made him to meet for Transgressors, namely, by way of intercession for Transgressors, as our Translations do phrase it.

2 In *Isa.*59.16. Hee wondred that none was made to meet, namely, as an Intercessor; the *Geneva* saith, Hee wondred that none would offer himself; the Seventy say, Hee wondred that there was none to deliver. But the first sense is most full with the Hebrew.

3 In *Jer.*15.11. I will make, or cause the enemy to meet thee in the time of thy affliction, or I will cause him to intreat thee well; The Seventy say, to assist thee.

4 In

4 In *Jeremy* 36. 25. The three men (there named) had made to meet, namely, they had made an agreement (as *Jobs* three friends did, *Job* 2.11.) to meet the King, as Intercessors, that hee would not burn the rowl; The *Geneva* say, They besought him; But the Seventy say, They opposed or resisted him, namely, by their intercession and intreaties.

5 In *Job* 36.32. *With clouds he covereth the light, and commandeth it by that which commeth betwixt.* Mr. *Broughton* reads it thus, Hee chargeth it, as men do pray, namely, hee chargeth the clouds, as men do intercede by prayer, and *Tremelius* doth concur to that sense; and that sense may cause us to remember Gods promise in 1 *King.*8.35.36. *When they pray, I will give rain upon the Land*; and it may also cause us to remember *Deut.* 11.14. and *Zach.*10.1. &c.

Now seeing these five places in the conjugation *Hipbil* do signifie to cause, or make a meeting, and all of them by way of mediation or intercession, Doubtlesse the first place in *Isa.* 53.6. must in reason have the like signification.

Mr. *Norton* saith in page 48.

That the Hebrew word in the conjugation Hiphil, *doth signifie to meet together as upon a heap.*

Reply 1. I apprehend that the word *heap* doth but mislead the Reader, except hee can handsomely shew that every meeting (caused by any) is a heap; I grant that two or three meeting together, may bee called (*Kahal*) a Church, Synagogue, or Assembly, as I have shewed in the Jews Synagogue Discipline, but usually no meeting, but a great multitude, is called a heap: But it appears by what I have said, that this meeting of the Mediator caused by the Father, to mediate for the Elect, cannot fitly bee called a heap, though it may fitly bee called a meeting.

2. Saith Mr. *Norton* in page 153.

The iniquities of us all, gathered together as in a heap, were laid upon him. And thirdly, in page 93. hee saith, *That all the curses of the Law were heaped together, and laid upon him.*

Reply 2. By this you see the reason why Mr. *Norton* doth make *Pagah* to signifie to meet together, as upon a heap, namely, that he may make Christ to bee both a heap of sin, and a heap of curses, in a legal and formal sense.

3 Mr. *Norton* doth also confound his Reader, by telling him *That one Hebrew root hath contrary significations*; Piaculum, saith he, *doth signifie both a sacrifice, and a sinful deed.*

Sin is often taken in a metaphorical sense for a Sin-sacrifice, that procures Gods Attonement for sin.

Reply 3. If the Hebrew word for sin, bee taken in a metaphorical signification, as well as in a proper, then there is no contrary sense, though there is a differing sense; hee that shall point to a Priest making a sacrifice for sin, may say there is a sin; and he that shall point to *Cain* killing *Abel*, may also say there is a sin; the word Sin therefore must bee taken in each place where it is used, as the Context shall direct, sometimes in a proper sense, and sometimes in a metaphorical; And for the want of this observation, a man may make a contrary signification of *Piaculum*, or else not.

The word Sin in *Exod.*30.10. is there put for the Sin-offering, and that sin is by the Seventy called the purgation of sin, and in 2 *Chron.*29.24. they render it the expiation of sin, and in *Exod.* 29. 36. the cleansing of sin, and in *Ezek.* 43. 22. the Propitiation or Reconciliation, and in *Ezek.* 44. 27. the appeasing for sins, and in *Num.*19.12,13,19. the Purification. And the reason why sin is named by these several names, is, because the Sin-offering was ordained to appease Gods anger, to expiate, to purge, and to cleanse the sinner from his sin; yea the word sin is rendred by the Seventy, the change, or the exchange in *Zach.*13.1. and that most fitly, because the sin (namely the Sin-offering) doth cause a true change in the sinner from unclean to clean, and from enmity to Reconciliation. These and such like phrases given to sin by the figure *Metonymia*, shews the word to have a differing sense, but not a contrary sense, as Mr. *Norton* affirms, to amuse his Reader; the like happily may be said to his other Instances: But for further light, See what I have replied to the signification of *Azab*, in *Psal.* 22.1.

4 I will now return to speak further of the Hebrew word *Pagah*; take it without the conjugation *Hiphil*, and then it signifies only to meet; but the particular occasions of every meeting, must bee sought out by the circumstances of each place where the word is used. As for example.

1 It signifies the meeting of the bounds of the Tribes in this or that place.

2 It may signifie the meeting of time, as when the Forenoon doth meet with the Afternoon, or the meeting of words, or the meeting of persons for this or that end, either in mercy, or in wrath.

3 *Pagah* to meet, is applied to Gods meeting with man, or to mans meeting with God in his worship. *Moses and Aaron, said unto* Pharaoh, *The Lord God of the Hebrews hath met with us, and commanded us to go into the wilderneſſe to offer ſacrifices to him; therefore wee pray thee, let us go three dayes journey to ſacrifice to the Lord our God, leſt hee meet us with Peſtilence*, &c. *Exod.*3.18. and *Exod.*5.3. So alſo in *Numb.*23.3.4,5,15.16. *Balaam* did meet the Lord with ſacrifice, and the Lord was pleaſed to meet him with words of advice what he ſhould ſay to *Balak*: In theſe places *Pagah* is put for Gods meeting with man, and mans meeting with God. And in *Gen.*23.8. *Abraham* ſaid to the people of the land, *If it bee your mind that I ſhould bury my dead, meet with* Ephron *for mee*; namely, meet him by way of intreaty; the Seventy ſay, Speak for mee: And ſo *Ruth* ſaid to *Naomi*, *Meet mee not to leave thee*, that is to ſay, Meet me not by thy earneſt intreaties to leave thee, *Ruth* 1.16.

So *Jacob* met *Eſau*, namely, with an acceptable preſent, to cover his face, that is, to appeaſe his anger, *Gen.*32.20. as we ſee it did in *Gen.*33.8,10. Theſe Inſtances ſhew that *Pagah* is uſed for a meeting in divers reſpects.

And after this manner God ordained Chriſt to bee our High Prieſt to meet the Lord with that moſt acceptable gift of himſelf in a Sacrifice; for it is of neceſſity that every Prieſt that meets with God, to mediate his reconciliation to ſinners, muſt have ſuch an excellent thing to offer unto God, as hee will accept, and therefore it muſt bee that which is conſtituted by a mutual Covenant, *Heb.*8.3. and the thing appointed was the beſt thing that Chriſt had to meet God withal, and that was his

Chriſt attoned his Fathers wrath with the Sacrifice of his body & blood.

his vital soul, with his body and blood, offered in perfect obedience to Gods will, notwithstanding Sathan endeavoured to disturb his obedience; with this present Christ did meet his offended Father, that was most justly provoked by *Adams* sin, and by our sins; and so according to Covenant, God accepted this Priest and Sacrifice for the attoning, and the appeasing of his wrath, as the word Attonement doth signifie. Of which word, see more in Chap. 14. pag. 142, 143.

In this sense, I say, the Father made, or caused the Mediator to meet him for the iniquities of us all.

1 He met his Father in his eternal Council and Contract: And 2 In the execution of it.

Pagnin renders this verse two wayes, indifferently.

1 *Occurrere fecit ei pœnam.*

2 *Vel rogare fecit eum pro iniquitate.*

And both these readings may well agree to the same sense.

1 He made the iniquities of us all to meet upon him, namely, hee made him to undertake our sins, as our Priest and Sacrifice, to make Attonement for them; and in this sense the Dialogue hath expounded this verse.

2 The Lord made him to meet for the iniquities of us all, or caused him to meet him as our Priestly Mediator with the Sacrifice of his body, for the iniquities of us all. And thus both readings do agree to the same sense; but because the last is more exact according to the Hebrew, therefore now I follow that.

So Mr. *Clendon* in Justification justified, p. 11.

The Chaldy Paraphrase of this verse speaks thus, And the Eternal is well pleased to remit the sins of us all for his sake.

And *Tindal* translates it thus:

But through him the Lord pardoneth all our sins.

From these Translations and Expositions it follows,

1 That the Doctrine of Gods imputing our sins to Christ, in Mr. *Nortons* sense, was not held forth by these Translators, neither can it be proved from this verse, nor from any other, when the right interpretation is given, and Mr. *Norton* himself confesseth thus much in general, That the guilt of our sins could not bee imputed to Christ, unlesse he did first become our legal

Surety

Surety in the same obligation with *Adam* in *Gen.*2.17. But I have shewed in Chap.2. and elsewhere, with the concurrence of sundry eminent Divines, that Christ was not our legal Surety in the same obligation with *Adam*; and therefore by his own confession, untill hee prove that Christ was *Adams* Surety, *Gen.*2.17. his Doctrine of Imputation is without a foundation, and thence it follows, that it must needs bee an unsound Assertion, to hold that God imputed our sins to Christ as the meritorious cause of his death and sufferings: But yet though I deny Christ to bee our legal Surety, I do notwithstanding freely grant that he undertook our cause as our voluntary Surety, according to the voluntary Covenant, and that he took our sins on him thus far namely, to make expiation for them, and to enter the Lists with Satban, and to suffer the punishments of our sins, before hee made his Sacrifice, as I have instanced in the punishments that men do voluntarily undergo when they strive for the Mastery with their opposite Champion.

2 Hence it follows by the right Translation and Exposition of *Isa.*53.6. and *Jer.*30.21. that there passed a Covenant made between the Trinity for mans Redemption, by the sufferings, and by the death and sacrifice of Christ. *Mr. Rutherford* of the Covenant proves by eleven Arguments, in page 290. and by a twelfth Argument, in page 307. and by a thirteenth Argument in page 316. that there passed a Covenant between the Trinity from Eternity.

It is evident by Isa.53.6. & by Jer.30.21. that there passed a Covenant between the Trinity from Eternity, for mans Redemption.

The Dialogue saith thus, in page 28.

The true manner how the Lord laid all our sins upon Christ (in *Isa.*53.6.) was after the same manner as the Lord laid the sins of *Israel* upon the Priest and Sacrifice, and no otherwise, as in *Exod.*28.38. and in *Lev.*10.17.

Mr. *Norton* doth answer in page 43.

Whatsoever your words are, we presume your meaning is, That the Types instanced in, did not typically hold forth any imputation of sin, to Christ the Antitype.

Reply 1. The meaning of the Dialogue is plain, namely, that Christ bare our sins, as the typical Priest and Sacrifice did bear the sins of *Israel*: And the Priests are said to bear all their

sins, because they offered publick sacrifices to procure a legal Attonement for the sins of all *Israel*; and so Christ bare our sins, because hee made his soul a Sacrifice by his Priestly power, by which he procured his Fathers Attonement for all our sins formally.

2 In the Dialogue, in page 25. I have shewed, how Christ may be said to bear our sins several other wayes, and yet not as a guilty sinner by a formal legal imputation, as Mr. *Norton* holds.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 44.

Put case you produce a Type which holdeth not forth bearing of sin by imputation in the Antitype, except it may appear that the manner of Christs bearing sin, was thereby fully intended, you conclude nothing.

Reply 2. The Dialogues instances do make it appear plain enough to the willing to bee informed, That the manner of Christs bearing sin, was thereby fully intended; but to a byassed spirit it is not easie to be done; Let the Reader peruse the Dialogue, and then judge.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 44.

It is very true, God laid our sins upon Christ as upon our Sacrifice, Isa. 53.12. *Therefore say we, by Imputation.*

Reply 3. He doth acknowledge it to bee a truth, that God laid our sins upon Christ as upon our Sacrifice, therefore say wee, not by Mr. *Nortons* kind of imputation, for his kind of imputation is not to be found in the typical sacrifices; but the true manner of Christs bearing our sins as our Priestly Mediator may be found, because it was typified by the Priests eating of the peoples Sin-offering (as Mediators) in the holy place, as the Dialogue hath truly expounded *Lev.* 10.17. for their eating signified such a communion as Mediators must have between both parties in the work of Attonement.

And secondly, The Lord laid all our sins upon Christ as upon our sacrifice; and this is elegantly expressed by *Isaiah*, *He powred out his soul to death, and bare the sin of many, and made inter-*

cession

cession for transgressors, Isa.53.12. All these three terms, saith the Dialogue, are *Synonima's*.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 45.

Synonima's *are divers words signifying the same thing; but death, bearing sin, and intercession, are doubtlesse divers things, though they concur as ingredients to the same Mediatorship.*

Reply 4. I cannot find any thing in this answer to confute the *Synonimas* expressed by the Dialogue; I think this answer is meerly intended to amuse the Reader; The Dialogue shews plainly that all these three terms are metaphorical *Synonimas*, being all joyned together in this Text, to declare unto us, the true manner how the Lord made Christ to bear all our sins as our Sacrifice.

1 His death is put for his sacrifice.

2 His sacrifice bears all our sins from us, because it procures Gods Attonement.

3 By the eternal efficacy of his Death and Sacrifice, he makes continual intercession for us, and so hee doth still bear our sins by his continual interceding Gods Attonement: And thus all these terms are *Synonimas*; and to this I shall speak more fully in *Reply* 18.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 45.

The force of this Reason is, that Christs sacrifice was effectual to procure Attonement, therefore sin was not imputed to him: A nisi non sequitur: Nay the contrary consequence is true; Christ (saith hee) appeared, that is, Was manifested in the flesh to put away sin, *Heb.9.26.* was once offered to bear the sins of the many, verse 28. *The Greek word here used by* Paul, *and elsewhere by* Peter, 1 *Pet.2.24. signifies to take, carry, or bear up on high, and that so as to bear away; and this is an allusion to the Rite of the whole Burnt-offering.*

Reply 5. In this Answer Mr. *Norton* labors to prove that Christ bare our sins by Gods Imputation, by *Heb.9.26. 28.* *Christ appeared*, that is (saith he) *was manifested in the flesh*; hee little minded the Context, in saying that his appearing here, Heb.9.26.28

did signifie his manifesting in the flesh, for it is easie to bee discerned that his appearing here, doth signifie his appearing before God with his sacrifice for sin (and that was three and thirty yeers after his first appearing in the flesh, as I noted from his approaching unto God in the beginning of this Chapter) by which hee put away sin, namely, all Sin-offerings, according to that in *Dan.9.24. Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy City, to finish Transgresse (offerings) and to end Sin (offerings) and to make reconciliation for iniquity* (as the meritorious cause) *and to bring in an everlasting Righteousnesse*, instead of the ceremonial, as our money brings in our cloathing; and then it follows in *Pauls* next words, *That Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many*; this Greek word to bear, here used by *Paul*, and elsewhere by *Peter* (saith Mr. *Norton*) signifies to take, carry, or bear up on high, and that so, as to bear away; now apply his Rule in page 44. to what he saith here, and there hee answers himself to what hee reasons here; *Put case* (saith he) *you produce a Type which holdeth not forth bearing of sin by imputation in the Antitype, except it may appear that the manner of Christs bearing sin was thereby fully intended, you conclude nothing*; So say I of this Text of *Heb.9.28.* except Mr. *Norton* can make it appear, That the manner of Christs bearing our sins was fully intended by this Text to be by Gods legal imputation, he concludes nothing; he saith that the Greek word here for bearing, and in *1 Pet.2 24.* is the same; I grant it, but yet it hath a several sense in those two places, as I have shewed in the Dialogue.

Dan.9.24.

Christ put away sin, namely all Sin-offerings by his being made the only true Sacrifice for sin.

1. I have shewed that Christ in his conflict with Sathan, bare our sins as a Porter bears a burthen, as it is in *1 Pet.* 2.24. according to *Gen.* 3.15.

But secondly, In *Heb.9.24.* Hee bears our sins as our Priest and Sacrifice, when hee died formally by his own Priestly power, by this sacrifice hee procured Gods Attonement, by which our sins are formally born away from us; And saith the Apostle, *Unto them that look for him, shall hee appear the second time without sin unto salvation*; namely, Hee shall appear the second time, without being made a Sacrifice for sin, unto salvation, which is thus opened by the coherence of the Chapter in vers. 12. *Neither by the blood of Goats, Bucks, and Bulls, but by his own blood, hee went once for all into the holy place, having found eternal Redemption*

demption for us; and therefore hee comes not the second time to bee offered in sacrifice for sins. but hee shall come without a Sin-sacrifice unto eternal salvation, as I have shewed in Ch. 3. in expounding *Gal.* 4. 4.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 45.

The person that brought his sacrifice was to put his hand upon the head thereof, yet living; Lev. 1. 4. *as confessing his guilt, and putting, or imputing it upon the Beast to bee sacrificed.* Compare *Exod.* 29. 10. *Lev.* 4. 4, 29. and 5. 5, 6. and 16. 21. *By the like Ceremony of Imposition of hands, sin was charged both for the testifying of the accusation, and the stoning of the offender,* Deut. 17. 7. *Guilt thus typically imputed to the beast, it was slain, and laid upon the Altar.*

Reply 6. The Dialogue hath cleerly shewed in page 33. That the act of imposing hands on the head of the sacrifice, did ty- Prov. 28. 13.
pifie the owners faith of dependance on the true Sacrifice, that hee confessing and forsaking his sins should have Gods mercy, namely, through the true Sacrifice he should have Gods merciful Attonement and Reconciliation.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 234.

It is disproved that their laying on of hands did typifie their relying upon the Sacrifice of Christ for such Attonement.

Reply 7. I cannot as yet find it disproved, and I have shewed in the Dialogue, That the laying on of hands did typifie their faith of dependance in relying on the Sacrifice of Christ, as the meritorious procuring cause of Gods Attonement; If so, then it did not signifie Gods imputing our sins to Christ; and therefore that inference is a false inference, and no disproving of the Dialogue.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 45.

By the like Ceremony of Imposition of hands, sin was charged, both for the testifying of the accusation, and the stoning of the offender, Deut. 17. 7.

The Imposition of hands upon the head of the condemned person by the witnesses was to testifie their faith, that the evidence they had given in against him was true. Deut. 17. 7.

Reply 8. This is another false inference, for the accusation was testified before his condemnation, or else he could not have been condemned, and that was done without any imposition of hands; therefore this act of the witnesses in laying on their hands on the head of the condemned person, was rather to testifie their own personal faith and confidence to the Throwers of stones, that the testimony they had formerly given was true. And thus Mr. *Norton* Instance is a strong confutation of his kind of legal imputation, as to the point of condemnation; for this Imposition was not ordained to signifie the imputation of his sin before his sentence of condemnation.

a As for the Imposition of hands upon the Beast to bee slain in Sacrifice, together with confession of sin, It is cleer by that confession that sin was imputed to him that confessed it (and not to the Beast) and in that respect, he presented his clean Beast to be sacrificed, to reconcile God to him for his sin which he had confessed, and his imposition of hands testified his faith of dependance on his typical sacrifice for the procuring of Gods Attonement for his Ceremonial sins, and typified his faith of dependance on Christ the true Sacrifice for the procuring of Gods Attonement for his moral sins. But I will not inlarge further here, because the Dialogue is full in this point, where the impartial Reader may find satisfaction.

The Dialogue saith thus:

If you will build the common Doctrine of Imputation upon this phrase, *The Lord hath laid all our iniquities upon Christ*, then by the same phrase you must affirm that the Father laid all our sins upon himself, by imputing all our sins to himself, because the Father is said to bear our sins as well as Christ, in *Psal.* 32. 1. and *Psal.* 25. 18.

Mr. *Norton* doth thus answer in page 46.

This is but one place of very many, whereupon the doctrine of Imputation is builded.

Reply 9. The Reader may please to take notice of this confession; but why then doth himself make so much use of this Scripture

Scripture to prove his kind of Imputation, seeing now at last he grants it to be no sure proof for saith he, *This is but one place of very many, wherein the doctrine of Imputation is builded*: and yet I find it as much used for that purpose as any Scripture, except 2 Cor. 5. 21.

2 The Dialogue doth not deny, but affirm, that Christ bare our sins, both as a Porter bears a burden, in his conflict with Sathan, according to Gods declared will, in *Gen.* 3. 15. and also as our Priestly Mediator in procuring Gods Attonement for our sins by his propitiatory Sacrifice.

The Dialogue also affirmeth that God the Father bears, or bears away our sins as a reconciled Supreme, by acquitting us of our sins upon satisfaction received by the said propitiatory Sacrifice of Christ; But *Mr. Norton* makes a wrong sense of the Dialogue in this point, as if the Dialogue held that the Creditor paid the debt, because he is said to discharge the Debtor. But I refer the Reader for satisfaction to my *Reply* to what Reconciliation is, in Chap. 14. &c.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 46.

Sure you mistake your self in arguing out of this Text from the word Nasa, *for* Nasa *is not in the Text.*

Reply 20. *I never said that Nasa was in this Text of Isa.* 53. 6. I cited *Nasa* only from *Psal.* 32. 1. and from *Psal.* 25. 18. where the Father is said to bear our sins; and from thence the Dialogue doth reason to our translated term in *Isa.* 53. 6. *The Lord hath laid upon him the iniquities of us all.* And hence the Dialogue doth reason thus, If this phrase [*of laying upon*] and so consequently of bearing, in *Isa.* 53. 6. doth imply that Christ did bear the guilt of our sins by Gods imputation, then by this phrase the Father must bear the guilt of our sins also, for he is said to bear our sins in *Ps.* 32. 1. and in *Ps.* 25. 18. This Argument is unavoidably true, by building the doctrine of Imputation upon that phrase.

2. By this nimble catch of Mr. *Norton*, he would have this Reader to believe that the Dialogue holds that which it holds not; but I have more fully answered to this cavil in Chap. 22. Sect. 1. and there I have shewed how Mr. *Norton* hath wronged the sense of the Dialogue in other places also. But

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 49.

There is a difference between an act typifying Gods imputation of sin unto Christ, and an act testifying our faith concerning Gods imputation of sin unto Christ; And saith he, *You should have produced your Expositors, for they do not generally so speak.*

Reply 11. This speech they do not generally so speak, is an acknowledgement that some do so speak: And indeed many late Writers do say, That imposition of hands, with confession of sin, did typifie Gods imputing our sins to Christ. See *Taylor* on Types; and *Weems* on the Ceremonial Laws, saith thus on the Sin-offering, They were commanded to lay their hands upon the head of the Sin-offering, *Lev* 4. to signifie, that they laid over their sins upon the Beast, which was a type of Christ, who was made (*Asham*) an offering for sin, *Isa.*53.10. and was made sin for us, 2 *Cor.*5.21. that is, The guilt of our sins was imputed to him; he was not made a sacrifice only for our sins, but hee was made sin for us. In these words of Mr. *Weems*, and more also which I omit, hee hath not a word of our faith of dependance, which was truly typified by Imposition of hands, but he doth only say that it typified Gods imputing our sins. I could cite many others that run that way, on *Exod.*29. 10.&c. but I had rather (though they bee obvious) cover their names, than publish them.

But the Dialogue in page 33. *disproves their Exposition thus*:

A private mans Imposition cannot represent Gods act; The Imposition of the hands of the Elders cannot, because the Elders action represents the Churches action; neither can the Imposition of the Priests, and the High Priests', because they were types of Christs Priestly Nature, and not of the Father.

Mr. *Norton* returns this Answer in page 49.

If these Reasons were good for what they are alleged, yet they are impertinent, as not reaching the mind of Expositors, at least generall upon the place.

Reply 12.

Reply 12. It is an eaſie anſwer to ſay they are impertinent, but the indifferent Reader may ſee they are pertinent.

2 Saith hee, Expoſitors, at leaſt generally, do not ſo expound; I wiſh that fewer did: but I do alſo confeſs that I do not find (though I have made diligent inquiry) that any of the Ancient Divines did hold, that God imputed our ſins to Chriſt, in Mr. *Nortons* ſenſe, as I have ſhewed in the next Chapter; yea I find that many late Writers alſo have no ſuch imputation; but too many have, ſome I have named, and many more are obvious to the intelligent; and it is evident, that generally the Antinomians do hold as Mr. *Norton* holds: I ſay it is obvious to the intelligent, that many do make the impoſition of hands on the head of the ſacrifice, with confeſſion of ſin, to ſignifie Gods imputing our ſins to Chriſt; and therefore the reaſons of the Dialogue above-named, are ſound and good, for what they are alleaged, namely, That impoſition of hands by the ſaid perſons, could not repreſent Gods action.

But ſaith Mr. *Norton* in page 49.

There is nothing repugnant in the nature of the thing, but that the act of a private perſon was capable (if God ſo pleaſed) to become a type of Gods act, which is alſo true concerning the Elders and Prieſts.

Reply 13. It is well he hath put in, If God ſo pleaſed, I ſay to him, as he ſaid to me, in page 103. if hee ſhould not put in that, he could expect no other but utmoſt abhorrence, &c. But hee had ſpoken more full to the point, if hee had proved, that God had ordained ſuch perſons in that act of Attonement to repreſent God the Father; but becauſe hee doth no more but barely ſay ſo, it will not ſatisfie a doubting conſcience.

But ſaith Mr. Norton in page 50.

The act of an Iſraelite (though a private perſon) in letting his Hebrew ſervant go free for nothing, either at the ſeventh year, Exod. 21. 2. or at the year of Jubilee, Exod. 25. 40. figured, or repreſented, God the Fathers gift of free Redemption by Jeſus Chriſt.

Reply 14. Good reason there is for it, because God ordained it so to bee, and therein the Master being also a Father to his servant, in letting his servant go free, was a type of the father of mercies in that case.

2 As to his instance of *Cyrus*, in making him both a type of Christ, in page 101. and also a type of the Father, in his 50 page, by his free deliverance, is a very doubtful instance, for it is questioned by learned Divines whether hee were a type; but in case it were proved that hee was indeed a type, yet it reacheth not to prove that all those that imposed hands on the head of their sacrifice were types of Gods imputing our sins to Christ, which is the very point on Mr. *Norton's* part to be proved, but he slides from that to instances of by matters.

But saith the Dialogue.

If you make the act of laying on of hands on the Sin-offering, to signifie Gods laying our sins upon Christ by his imputation, then the same act with confession of sins upon the Scape-goat, must also signifie that God did impute our sins to Christ, as well after he was escaped from death by his Resurrection and Ascension, as when he made his oblation here upon earth; And so by this Doctrine, Christ is gone as a guilty sinner into heaven.

2 The Dialogue propounds another Argument which Mr. *Norton* skips over, and that is this:

If you make this imposition of hands upon the head of the Sin-offering to represent Gods laying the sins of the Elect upon Christ by his imputation, then the same act of imposition upon the head of their sacrifices of praise, must have the same signification; for every owner must impose both his hands with all his might upon the head of his sacrifice of praise, with confession of his particular mercies received: This act must needs signifie the laying of their persons by their faith of dependence on the sacrifice of Christ for the procuring of Gods favourable acceptation of their praises, and therfore their laying on of hands on the head of their Sin-offering, did likewise signifie their faith of dependence on Christ typified.

Mr.

Mr. *Norton* doth thus answer in page 51.

We have already said that we make not this act a type of Gods laying sin upon Christ.

Reply 15. This is a good confession, and I wish that others would take full notice of it, namely, that there is not a sufficient ground from the typical act of Imposition of hands on the sacrifice with confession of sin, to typifie Gods imputing our sins to Christ; and therefore it follows hence, that the translated phrase, *The Lord hath laid upon him the iniquities of us all*, in *Isa.* 53. 6. is not a sufficient proof of it, though it be alleaged for that purpose.

2 Seeing Mr. *Norton* doth at last make this confession, why then hath hee laboured to defend the imputation of sin from the said imposition of hands, with confession of sin, as he hath done?

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 51.

Sin was laid upon the Scape-goat, not after, but before its escape.

Reply 16. If sin was imputed at all to the Scape-goat, it is sure enough that it must bee done before its escape, for after it was escaped, it was too late to lay on hands upon the head of it. But saith the Dialogue, It escaped with that act of imposition upon the head of it; and therefore that act of imposition did typifie that Christ doth still bear our sins by Gods imputation in heaven, as much as on earth: But saith the Dialogue, The Hebrew Doctors did not understand this imposition to typifie Gods imputing our sins to Christ; but on the contrary, they understood it to bee a typical sign of their faith of dependence, depending upon Christs sacrifice for the procuring of Gods Attonement for the sins they had confessed over the head of it, and so much the prayer of the high Priest doth import; for when he imposed his hands upon the live Scape-goat, hee said thus, *O Lord, make Attonement now for the sins, and for the iniquities, and for the trespasses of thy people Israel.* See *Ainsw.* in *Lev.* 16. 21. And in this sense, the Lord made the iniquity of us all to meet upon him, because his once offering was sufficient to procure Gods Attonement for all our iniquities.

Mr. Norton answers thus in page 52.

Mr. *Ainsworth* on this very place saith, *That this all shewed how our sins should be imputed to Christ; It is not likely therefore that he so understood the Hebrew Doctors, otherwise we might well think, hee would have forborn a needlesse citation.*

Reply 17. The studious in Mr. *Ainsworth* cannot but take notice that Mr. *Ainsworth* doth often cite the Hebrew Doctors in a differing sense from himself, and so leaves the Reader to his choice.

2 The Dialogue did not cite *Ainsworth* in *Lev.* 16. 21. for his own judgement, but for the judgement of the Hebrew Doctors cited by him, as I shewed in the Dialogue page 39. and in the Epistle to the Reader page 3. I have shewed that Mr. *Broughton* (who was well read in the Hebrew Doctors) did often affirm that the Jews generally do stumble at these two Positions of ours.

1 Because we make Christ to stand before God as a guilty sinner, by his imputing our sins to him.

And secondly, Because wee make the Messiah to suffer the vindicative curse of the Law for our Redemption. But if the Hebrew Doctors had held that imposition of hands, with confession of sins upon the head of the sacrifice, had typified Gods imputing our sins to the sacrifice, they could not have so stumbled at our said Tenents as they do; they despise the imputed righteousnesse of Christ (saith Mr. *Weams* in his four Regenerations, page 318.) and they jest at this, that one should bee punished (in a legal way) for anothers fault.

3 It may be worth the while, for such as are able to search into the Hebrew Doctors, to see how they do understand the signification of this Imposition, with confession of sin.

Christ doth still bear our sins in heaven as much by Gods imputation, as ever he bare them upon earth.

4 Saith the Dialogue, If Gods imputing the sins of the Elect to Christ was the (meritorious) cause of Gods extreme wrath upon him; then by the same reason, Christ doth still bear the said wrath of God, for Christ doth still bear our sins in heaven, as much as ever he bare them here upon earth, according to the type of the Scape-goat.

Mr. *Norton*

Mr. *Norton* Answers thus in page 52.

Christ on earth suffered the wrath of God, that is, The execution of Divine Justice, because he then stood as a Surety to satisfie the curse due for sin, Isa. 53.10. *but having satisfied it,* Joh. 19.30. Col. 2.14. *the same Justice that before punished him, now acquits him,* Rom. 8.34. *If the Debtor be discharged, and the Bill cancelled, doubtlesse the Surety is free.*

Reply 18. I shall not need to examine the particulars of this Answer at this time, because it is no answer, but a plain evasion to the Dialogues Argument, which is this:

Christ by his Intercession is still satisfying the justice of God for the sins of the Elect, even as long as the Elect are under sin in this world; and thence the Dialogue infers, that in case Christ bare our sins here on earth by Gods imputation, then hee doth still bear our sins in heaven by Gods imputation; for hee doth still bear away our sins by his intercession in heaven, according to the type of the Scape-goat.

This Argument Mr. *Norton* hath not answered, but evaded with a by-answer; but saith Mr. *Norton*, If the Debtor bee discharged, and the Bill cancelled, doubtlesse the Surety is free: I have oft replied, That seeing Mr. *Norton* doth hold that Christ (as our legal Surety) hath made full satisfaction in kind, both by fulfilling the Law of Works, and suffering the eternal curse, thence it follows, according to his own conclusion, That the Surety having paid the full debt, and cancelled the Bill, the sinner is free from all sin, *ipso facto*, and so not liable to ask any pardon for sin at Gods hand, nor liable to any temporal plague, no more than *Adam* in his innocency: But say I, because his satisfaction was but the *tantidem*, therefore it is otherwise, even as I have shewed in Chap. 4.

2 This conclusion of Mr. *Nortons*, If the Debtor bee discharged, and the Bill cancelled, then doubtlesse the Surety is free, seems to bee drawn from *Col.* 2.14. (as hee hath cited it above) *Blotting out the hand-writing of Ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, he took it out of the way, nayling it to the Crosse.* I say, his conclusion from this Scripture, is a grosse abuse of this Scripture, for though Christ hath blotted out

the hand-writing of the Ceremonial Laws that was against us, yet for all that the moral Law doth still continue against us, and doth continually charge us with the breach thereof, and therefore the debt of punishment due to us for sin is not discharged in full, in respect of temporal plagues, though it bee discharged in full in respect of eternal condemnation to all that beleeve in the Promised Seed; I say, that till the Resurrection, all the godly do still suffer for sin both in their life, in their death, and in their putrifaction in their graves, and therefore they do still stand in need of the daily intercession of Christ for the pardon of their sins by the satisfaction of Christ continually presented unto God; and in this respect Christ doth stil bear away our sins in heaven by his Priestly intercession, as much as ever hee did when hee was here upon earth, as I noted afore in *Reply* 4. And this doth plainly shew, that the satisfaction of Christ was not *Ejusdem*, but *Tantidem*. If Christ had been our legal Surety to pay the uttermost farthing in kind at his death, then our Redemption had been perfect at once; but because his satisfaction was but the *tantidem*, therefore it was agreed, that wee should have our Redemption but by degrees; and therefore wee must still wait for the full redemption of our bodies till the time appointed, as I have shewed in Chap. 4.

3 Hence it follows, that this legal Court-way, in making Christ a legal Surety, & so liable to suffer the eternal curse from Gods legal imputation, &c. is none of Gods way in point of satisfaction (as I have often noted, to have it the better marked, and searched into) but it was the Devils way to make Christ a legal sinner, and to that purpose hee stirred up false witnesse to make a legal proof of his sinful imputations, and then hee stirred up *Pilate* to proceed to a legal condemnation of him to the odious death of the Crosse; and hence some infer (to admiration) that when *Pilate* sate on his Tribunal, God sate on his Tribunal to sentence Christ with the eternal curse; as if *Pilates* Court-proceedings, were a type of God the Fathers Court-proceedings; but I have oft noted, that Gods way was to commissionate Sathan to bee Christs Combater, and to arm him to his utmost skill, and that Christ was to win the victory by his constant practice, and obedience.

Con-

Conclusion.

Hence it follows, that neither the phrase, *The Lord hath laid upon him the iniquity of us all*, in *Isa.* 53. 6. nor the phrase of imposing hands on the head of the Sin-offering, with confession of sin, in *Lev.* 1. 4. *Ex.* 29. 10. *Lev.* 4. 4. and 5. 5, 6. and *Lev.* 16. 21. do prove that God imputed the guilt of our sins to Christ as the meritorious cause of any of his sufferings, much lesse of suffering Hell-torments, as Mr. *Norton* doth most boldly, and groundlesly affirm, for all his Scripture proofs are but Scriptures perverted.

CHAP. XIV.

2 Cor. 5. 21. *Examined.*

Mr. *Norton* saith in page 53.

1 *That Christ was made sin for us, as we were made Righteousnesse*, that is, saith he, *by judicial imputation, without the violation, yea with the establishing of justice.*

2 *That Christ was made sin, as he was made a curse*, Gal. 3. 13. *the Greek here used, and there, are the same: But* (saith he) *he was made a curse by judicial imputation, because he was the Sin-offering in truth, therefore he was made sin by real imputation, as the legal Sin-offering, was made sin by typical imputation.*

Reply 1. MR. *Nortons* first comparative Argument cannot hold firm for these Reasons.

1 Because it is not framed to the words of the Text.

2 Because it is not framed to the sense of the Text.

1 It is not framed to the words of the Text, because he makes Christ to bee made sin for us by Gods imputation, in the same

ſame manner as wee are made righteous by the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt, for hee means it of the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt, and ſo hee opens his meaning in page 230. and in other places, that we are made righteous by the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt imputed; but any one that hath eyes in his head, may ſee, that the righteouſneſſe expreſſed in the Text, is called the righteouſneſſe of God, and not the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt, therefore his Argument is not framed to the words of the Text.

And ſecondly, the righteouſneſſe expreſſed is not the righteouſneſſe of God eſſentially, as Mr. *Norton* makes it to bee in page 230. but the righteouſneſſe of God the Father perſonally (and yet this nothing hinders but that the juſtification of beleeving ſinners is the work of the Trinity, becauſe they have an order of working in the ſeveral cauſes) and this is moſt cleer and evident, becauſe the Apoſtle doth plainly diſtinguiſh between God and Chriſt, from verſe 19, to the end of verſe 21. For, ſaith the Apoſtle in verſe 19. *God was in Chriſt*, thereby plainly noting two diſtinct perſons. I grant that others have miſtaken the word God, for the word Chriſt, before him, but had he been well adviſed, hee might have followed ſome eminent Divines that have more narrowly ſearched, not only into the words, but alſo into the ſenſe of this Text, and that have given their grounds for the differencing of the righteouſneſſe of God, from the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt, and then he might have been better adviſed, then to confound the righteouſneſſe of God with the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt, as hee doth without diſtinction, in page 230. and elſewhere.

The miſtaking of the righteouſneſſe of God, for the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt, in 2 Cor. 5. 21. is the cauſe of an erronious interpretation.

But thirdly, in caſe the righteouſneſſe of God in 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. and in other places, had been meant of the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt, as Mr. *Norton* doth make it, then the Text ſhould have run thus, *God made him to be ſin for us which knew no ſin, that we might be made the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt in him*; that is to ſay, *That we might be made the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt in Chriſt*; and then according to this interpretation, the word *God* muſt bee blotted out of the Text, and the word *Chriſt* put into the place of it: But I beleeve that Mr. *Norton* will abhor to ſay that the word *God* muſt be blotted out to put the word *Chriſt* into the place of it, and therefore by the ſame reaſon hee ſhould abhor to expound the righteouſneſſe of God to bee no other but the righ-

righteouſneſſe of Chriſt, eſpecially, ſeeing there is as much difference between them in the point of a ſinners righteouſneſſe, or juſtification, or reconciliation, as there is between the meritorious and formal cauſes of a ſinners juſtification or reconciliation.

I grant, that Chriſt is our righteouſneſſe in the meritorious cauſe, *Rom.* 5. 18. but I ſay alſo, that it is God the Fathers righteouſneſſe, that is the formal cauſe of our righteouſneſſe.

4 Mr. *Anthony Wotton* doth judiciouſly demonſtrate that the Apoſtle did not intend any compariſon here; and he doth alſo give two reaſons, why the righteouſneſſe of God cannot bee meant of the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt in this Text, to which I refer the Reader for further ſatisfaction, *de Reconc. Peccatoris, part.* 2. *lib.* 1. *cap.* 18. *Sect.* 16. *cap.* 20. *Sect.* 5, 6.

SECT. II.

2 I Will now labour to ſhew the true ſenſe of this Text, by which it will appear, that Mr. *Nortons* comparative Argument is not framed to the ſenſe of this Text: each clauſe in the Text lies thus:

1 [*For*] This word *For* is a cauſal particle, and implies for this cauſe.

2 *He:* namely, God the Father.

3 *Made*: that is to ſay, Ordained, Conſtituted, Appointed: but this could not bee without a mutual conſent and Covenant between the Trinity from Eternity; and ſo he was ordained, or conſtituted to bee made a curſe by his combating with Sathan, as it is declared in *Gen.* 3. 15.

4 *Made Him*: that is to ſay, Chriſt; Theſe two words, *He* and *Him* in the former part of this verſe, and *God* and *Him*, in the latter part of this verſe, muſt carefully bee marked, as a cleer diſtinction between the perſons, as I have alſo noted above.

5 *To bee ſin for us*: that is to ſay, To bee a Sin-ſacrifice for us, as it is rightly and fully opened in the Dialogue; this phraſe, *He was to be made ſin for us* (ſaith the Dialogue) muſt not bee taken in a proper literal ſenſe, but in a metaphorical ſenſe, be-

ing borrowed from the Levitical Law, where the sacrifices for sin are often called *Sin* in the Hebrew Text, though our English Translations have added the word Sacrifice by way of expositions; as for example in *Exod.* 29. 14, 36. the Hebrew saith thus, It is a sin, but wee translate it thus, It is a Sin-offering, we adde the word Offering to the word Sin, as the Hebrew text also sometimes doth, though very rarely, as in *Lev.* 6. 26. and *Lev.* 9. 15. the Priest that offereth it for sin; this is very neer the word Sin-offering, but almost every where the Hebrew doth call it a sin without any addition, as in *Ex.* 29. 14, 36. *Ex.* 30. 10. *Lev.* 4. 3. 8, 14, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 29, 32, 33. *Lev.* 5. 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12 *Lev.* 6. 17, 25, 30. *Lev.* 7. 7, 37. *Le.* 8. 2, 14. *Lev.* 9. 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 15, 22. *Lev.* 10. 16, 17, 19. *Lev.* 12. 6, 8. *Lev.* 14. 13, 19, 22, 31. *Lev.* 15. 15, 30. *Lev.* 16. 3, 5, 6, 9, 11, 15, 25, 27. *Lev.* 23. 19. *Num.* 6. 11, 14, 16. *Num.* 7. 16, 22, 28, 34, 40, 46, 52, 58, 64, 70, 76, 82, 87. *Num.* 8. 8, 12. *Num.* 18. 9. *Num.* 28. 15, 22. *Num.* 29. 11, 16, 19, 22, 25, 34, 38. 2 *Chron.* 29. 21, 23, 24. *Ezra* 8. 35. *Ezra* 10. 33. *Ezek.* 40. 39. *Ezek.* 42. 13. *Ezek.* 43. 21, 22, 25. *Ezek.* 44. 29. *Ezek.* 46. 20. *Hos.* 4. 8. *Hos.* 8. 11.

In all these places the Sin-offering is called Sin in the Hebrew text; and this Hebraism the Septuagint do follow, and the Chaldy Paraphrase, and the Apostle *Paul* in 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. and in *Rom.* 8. 3. and *Heb.* 10. 26. and the use was to expiate moral sins done in ignorance; but chiefly it was to expiate their ceremonial sins, as the places cited do witnesse.

These Scriptures do stare in the face of such as make Christ to bee sin for us by a judicial imputation, as Judges do when they impute sin to Malefactors, as the meritorious cause of inflicting legal punishments upon them.

6 It is added [*which knew no sin*] namely, no sin formally, neither by inherent corruption, nor by Gods legal imputation, and yet notwithstanding, though he was every way free, God did let Sathan loose upon him, as upon a Malefactor, to combate with his humane nature, to insnare him in some sin or other, and to impute sin to him, and so to peirce him in the Foot-soals as a wicked Malefactor on the Tree; and in this sense it is said by *Peter*, that God made him to bear our sins in his body on the Tree; these punishments of sin Christ suffered not necessarily (as we guilty sinners do) from Gods formal im-

imputation of sin, but voluntarily as a Combater with Sathan, without any formal guilt or desert on his part.

And secondly, He bare our sins as our Priest and Sacrifice, by procuring Reconciliation, and therefore he is said in *Isa.* 53. 10. to make himself *Asham*, a Trespasse, or Sin, as the Septuagint translate it.

And thus you see, that Christ made himself to bee sin, as much as God made him to be sin, namely, to be a sacrifice for sin, and no otherwise, as I have shewed in the Dialogue in page 42.

7 The reason or the end why God made him to be sin, is added in the next clause [*That we might be made the righteousnesse of God*] and this doth call to our consideration the Covenant between the Trinity for mans Redemption, for the Text saith, *That God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself*, vers. 19.

It is the righteousnesse of each person in Trinity to perform their Covenants to each other for the orderly reconciling and justifying of the Elect. Rom. 5. 18.

1 Consider, that Christ covenanted with his Father to combate with Sathan, and at last to be made a sacrifice for sin as the meritorious cause, for our reconciliation and justification. And hence it follows that as soon as hee had performed the said Sin-sacrifice, it is truly called His righteousnesse in *Rom.* 5. 18. and this is the true and full interpretation of the word Righteousnesse in that Text.

2 On the other hand the Stipulation or Covenant of the Father, was, that upon the performance of Christs sacrifice, he would bee reconciled to beleeving sinners, and the performance of this reconciliation on God the Fathers part, is called the Righteousnesse of God in this Text; and in this sense the Argument of the Apostle doth run, from verse 19. to the end of this 21. vers.

8 *In Him*: that is to say in Christ; for as soon as sinners are in Christ, by the work of the Holy Ghost, they are made partakers of Gods righteousnesse; for according to his Covenant with Christ, it is his righteousnesse to bee fully reconciled to sinners, as soon as they are in Christ by faith, by which means their sins are pardoned, and so they are justified from sin, or made formally righteous by this righteousnesse of God the Father.

And thus have I opened the true sense of this verse, by which it doth appear, that Mr. *Nortons* first comparative Argument

is not framed, neither to the words, nor to the true ſenſe of this verſe.

SECT. III.

No Scripture rightly interpreted, makes our ſins to be formally imputed to Chriſt by Gods legal imputation, as Mr. *Norton* holds.

IN Chapter 6. I have made an examination of Mr. *Nortons* ſeveral expreſſions about Gods judicial imputing our ſins to Chriſt, and I little queſtion, but what I have ſaid in that Chapter, and in Chap. 13. and what I ſay in this 14. Chapter, will ſatisfie the judicious and unpartial Reader.

2 Conſider the frame of Mr. *Nortons* Argument, and me thinks the very naming of it ſhould ſufficiently ſhew the dangerouſneſſe of it.

Chriſt ſaith, He was made ſin for us, as wee were made righteous (by the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt) that is (ſaith he) hee was made ſin by Gods judicial imputation, namely, a true ſinner formally; And ſo in like ſort hee holds, that Chriſts righteouſneſſe is imputed unto us to make a real change in our condition by making us formally righteous, and thus by his comparative Argument, our ſins were really imputed to Chriſt to make a real change in his condition, namely, to make him a ſinner formally by Gods judicial imputation, that ſo God might in juſtice inflict upon him the eſſential puniſhment of Hell-torments. Doth not the very repetition of this Argument plainly enough ſhew the dangerouſneſſe of it?

3 Mr. *Anthony Wotton* ſhews, that it is a palpable miſtake to aſſert the imputation of our ſins to Chriſt in the ſenſe of Mr. *Norton*, in *Reconcil. Peccatoris, part. 2. lib. 1. cap.* 18. *Sect.* 4. and to the end of the Chapter; of which I ſhall ſpeak more by and by.

In Vindicia fidei part. 2. pag. 165.

4 Mr. *John Goodwin* in his Elaborate Treatiſe of Juſtification, doth ſhew from the judgement of the orthodox, that nothing in 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. is there ſpoken touching the imputation of our ſins to Chriſt; and (ſaith he) of all the Scriptures that men take up for the plea of the imputation oppoſed, Mr. *Gataker* hath well obſerved that this Text is moſt cleer and pregnant againſt themſelves.

But

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 54.

The Sin-offering is so called, because sin was typically imputed to it; and it is said (saith he) *to be for sin, because it was offered for the expiation of sin.*

Reply 2. Mr. *Norton* affirms it was called sin, because sin was typically imputed to it, but he brings no Scripture to prove it, and therefore it must passe for no better than a fiction.

2 The Dialogue shews in page 41. that *Psal.* 40. 6. doth call the Sin-offering by no other addition but Sin; but the Dialogue saith, that the Apostle in Greek doth expound it *for sin* in *Heb.* 10. 6. the Apostle doth joyn the particle *For* to the word *Sin*, by which means hee doth teach us, that the Sin-offering was not typically made sin, by confession of sin, and by imposition of hands upon the head of it; the particle *For*, is not suitable to that sense, and so the Hebrew Text doth sometimes explain it self by joying the word *For*, to the word *Sin*, *The Sin shall be killed before the Lord, it is most holy*, Lev. 6. 25. and then it is explained in verse 26. *The Priest shall offer it for Sin*; hence I reason thus, if it had been made sin typically by Gods imputation, it could not have been called, *Most holy*, neither had it been accepted as a sacrifice for Sin, *Lev.* 6. 26. and so also the word *For* is annexed in *Lev.* 9. 15. *Lev.* 4. 14. Lev. 6. 26.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 54.

If Christ be made sin for us in the same sense that the water of Purification, and the Trespass money is called Sin, then Christ was made sin only figuratively, consequently suffered for sin figuratively, not properly.

Reply 3. A byassed spirit is apt to pick an exception against the cleerest expressions; the Dialogue speaks plainly, that the water of Purification was called Sin, *Numb.* 19. 9. not in respect of any sin that was typically imputed to it, nor was it called Sin, because it was imployed to any sinful use, but because it was ordained in the prescript use of it, to cleanse the sinner, *ex opere operato* from all such ceremonial sins as he was defiled with. See *Ainsw.* in *Num.* 19. 9, 12. &c. It was called Sin-water (as the

Sin-offering was called Sin) because it was the water of Purification from sin, and because it sanctified the unclean to the purifying of the flesh, *Num.* 8. 7, 21. and because it figured the blood of Christ, which only purgeth the conscience from dead works, that is to say, from moral sins, *Heb.* 9. 13, 14. Now the Argument of the Dialogue is plain, namely, that as the water of purification was called Sin, because it did truly cleanse the sinner from the outward contagion of his sins, whether moral sins that were done unadvisedly, or ceremonial sins, for which chiefly the Sin-water was ordained, that being cleansed therby, they might then approach to Gods presence in his Sanctuary, or else not, upon pain of cutting off, *Num.* 19, 20.

Heb. 9. 13, 14.

The like Reply I might also make for the Levitical phrase taken from the Redemption-mony that was imployed (or part of it at least) to buy the publick Sin-offerings, and Trespasse-offerings, It was called Sin-mony and Trespasse-mony, 2 *King.* 12. 16. *Neh.* 10. 32, 33. not because any sin or trespasse was imputed to the mony, as if it had been sinfully gotten, or sinfully imployed, but because it was imployed to buy the said Sin-offerings and Trespasse-offerings; and in this sense, God made Christ to be sin, and to be a trespasse, not by imputing the sins of the Elect to him in a judicial way, but by ordaining and constituting him to be the true Sin-offering, and to end all Sin-offerings, and to finish Trespasse (offerings) and to make Reconciliation for Iniquity by the Sacrifice of himself, and so by this means to bring in an eternal Righteousnesse or Reconciliation, *Dan.* 9. 24. instead of the Ceremonial.

Secondly saith Mr. *Norton*, *Then Christ was only made sin figuratively, and suffered for sin figuratively, not properly.*

Reply 4. Christ suffered for sin properly, according to Gods declared Counsel, Covenant, and Decree in *Gen.* 3. 15. in entring the Lists with Sathan, but at last, hee was the only Priest in the formality of his Death and Sacrifice, and in this Sin-offering he bare our sins not really by Gods judicial imputation, but figuratively only, he bare them from us by procuring Gods

Gods Reconciliation; No Scripture saith Reverend Mr. *Wotton*, doth make Christ to be a sinner properly.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 131.

Wee distinguish between an inherent judicial guilt, and an extrinsecal judicial guilt: If Thomas (saith he) *be judicially guilty of a capital crime inherently, though* Peter *be guiltlesse thereof inherently, yet if he be guilty thereof extrinsecally; it seemeth to be no injustice for the Magistrate (in case of Suretiship) to put* Peter *to death for* Thomas *his crime*, And after these words, Mr. *Norton* doth cite sundry instances to this purpose, and at last he concludes thus in page 133. *I dare almost say* (saith *Grotius*, a man excelling in this kind of learning) *That where there is consent, there is not any of those whom we call Pagans, who would esteem it unjust that one should bee punished with the delinquencie of another.*

Reply 5. By this last testimony of *Grotius*, Mr. *Norton* thinks that he hath knocked the nayl home on the head, and therefore he saith that *Grotius* was a man excelling in this kind of learning, and truly so hee was, though I find him to be very much out of the way in some things. But in vain doth Mr. *Norton* labour to make *Grotius* his abettor, for surely there is no greater opposite to Mr. *Nortons* imputation than he is. For *Grotius* saith thus; Some evil is sometimes imposed upon one, or some good is taken away; By occasion indeed of some fault; yet not so, that the fault is the immediate cause of that action, as to the right of doing: He (saith he) who by occasion of anothers debt, hath ingaged himself, suffers evil: But the immediate cause of his obligation is his promise, as hee who is become surety for a buyer, is not properly bound by the bargain, but by his promise; So also hee who is bound for a Delinquent, is not held by the delinquency, but by his ingagement: And hence it is, that the evil to bee born by him, receives its measure not from the fault of the other, but from the power which himself had in promising: Consequent whereunto is this (according to the opinion which

In his War & Peace, *l.* 2. *c.* 112 *p.* 398.

Sponde Noxa præstoest.

wee

wee beleeve to be the Truer) That no man can by his becoming surety loſe his* life, becauſe we determine no man hath ſuch right over his own life, that hee can take it from himſelf, or ingage it to bee taken away by another, though the Ancient Romans and Greeks were of another minde in this matter.

* Mans Law doth not allow Sureties for capital crimes. *Vide Panormitan. Rubr. de fide juſſoribus*, nor for judicial corporal pains. *vide digeſt. l. 2. tit. 13. Si quis cautionibus, lege quoties.* And ſaith *Mansey*, The Judges are warned that they take no ranſom of the Murderer, though he could give all the wealth in the world, and though the avenger of blood ſhould be willing to free him; for the ſoul of him that is killed, is not the poſſeſſion of the avener of blood, but the poſſeſſion of the holy bleſſed God. See *Ainſ.* in Num. 35. 31. Ex. 21. 25. Lev. 24. 19. Pſ. 49. 8. None have a true legal power over their own life but God, and the Magiſtrate, to whom God gives power over Delinquents.

(But it ſeems the latter Romans ſaw the inconvenience of their Anceſtors Cuſtomes, and therefore they made other Laws in oppoſition thereto. *Vide Codic. lib. 9. Tit. 47. de pœnis lege Sancimus.*)

And ſaith *Grotius* in the next page, what wee have ſaid of life ought to bee underſtood of members too; for a man hath not right over them, but for the preſervation of the body.

But (ſaith he) If exile or loſſe of mony were in the promiſe, and by the others fault the forfeiture was made, the Surety ſhall bear the loſſe, which yet in him, to ſpeak exactly, will not be a puniſhment, &c.

Ibidem, And (ſaith he) becauſe Beaſts are not properly guilty of a fault; when a beaſt is put to death (as in the Law of *Moſes* for copulation with man, *Lev.* 20, 15.) that is not truly puniſhment, but the uſe of mans dominion over the beaſt.

Then hee proceeds to ſhew in Chap. 113. that none is juſtly puniſhed, (in propriety of ſpeech) for anothers fault.

None (ſaith he) that is free from the fault can bee puniſhed for the fault of another, becauſe the obligation to puniſhment ariſeth from merit, and merit is perſonal, having its original from the will, than which nothing is more ours, whence it is called *ἀυτεξούσιον*.

And in Chap. 78. hee doth diſtinguiſh upon the word puniſh-

puniſhment, properly ſo called (and improperly ſo called) puniſhment in general (ſaith he) is the evil of paſſion which is inflicted for the evil of action; To be kept from Aſſemblies, or functions, are not properly puniſhments, although for a certain ſimilitude, and abuſively they are ſo called.

Hierax defined Juſtice to bee an exacting of puniſhment from offenders: And (ſaith he) puniſhment properly ſo named muſt be rendred to ſome * offence. This is alſo noted by *Auſtin*: All puniſhment (ſaith he) if it bee juſt, is the puniſhment of ſin; and in Chap. 113. *Grotius* cites *Auſtin* thus; God himſelf ſhould be unjuſt, if he ſhould condemn any one guiltleſſe, *Job* 34. 23.

Ibidem: God indeed threatens to puniſh the iniquities of the Fathers upon the children; But (ſaith hee) hee hath a moſt full right of Dominion, as over our goods, ſo over our lives too, being his gift, which without any cauſe, and at any time, he can take away from any one at his pleaſure. But (ſaith he) men may not imitate that vengeance of God: The reaſon is not alike, becauſe wee have ſaid, God without regard of the fault hath right over the life; men have not, but upon ſome great crime, and ſuch as is the perſons own; Wherefore that ſame Divine Law, as it forbids Parents to be put to death for their children, ſo it forbids children to be put to death for the deeds of their Parents; which Law pious Kings have followed even in the caſe of Treaſon, *Deut.* 24. 16. 2 *King.* 14. 6. And (ſaith he) at *ult.* An heir that is liable to others debts, is not liable to the puniſhment of the deceaſed; for though the heir doth bear the perſon of the deceaſed in reſpect of goods which are ingaged, yet not in reſpect of merits which are properly perſonal.

* *Vide Codic. l. 9. Tit 74 de pœnis lege Sanctimus.* There the Emperors *Arcadius*, and *Honorius* ſay thus, We appoint that puniſhment ſhall be there where the fault is; let offences bind their committers, and let no fear of puniſhment extend further than to ſuch as are guilty of crime. And to this purpoſe ſpeaks *P. Martyr* in Jud. 2. Eze 18. 20.

From theſe ſpeeches of Grotius *it follows*;

1. That hee did beleeve it to be the truer opinion; That no man can by his becoming Surety loſe his life, becauſe no man hath right over his own life; and therefore thoſe humane examples of taking away the life of Sureties for the faults of others, though they paſſe for good juſtice in Mr. *Nortons* opinion, yet not in *Grotius* opinion being rectified, nor in the Scriptures, and therefore Mr. *Norton* hath laboured in vain to make *Grotius* his abettor in this.

2 Hence it follows, that seeing *Grotius* held this as a principle, that the obligation to punishment doth arise from merit, and that merit is personal, having its original from the will, that hee could not hold (as Mr. *Norton* doth) that Christ was made legally guilty of our sins by Gods imputation.

3 Hence it follows, That the punishments that Christ suffered were not, in true propriety of speaking, legal punishments, because true legal punishments must bee inflicted for personal faults; and therefore hee could not hold that Christ suffered any punishments from Gods vindicative wrath.

4 Hence it follows, That the punishments which Christ suffered, are so called by a certain similitude, but not properly; the wounds received in the trial of Masteries from the opposite Champion, are improperly called punishments; no sufferings are properly punishments, but such as are legally inflicted for Delinquency.

5 Hence it follows, That the punishments which Christ suffered, were not inflicted on him from Gods legal and vindicative wrath; but hee suffered them from his voluntary combate with Sathan, and his Instruments, as I have at large shewed in Chap. 16. and in divers other places.

6 Hence it is evident, That Christ could not in true propriety of speech bee our legal Surety, in *Grotius* judgement, joyntly bound with us to fulfill the Law, and suffer the Curse, and so to pay our full debt in kind, as Mr. *Norton* holds.

7 I grant, notwithstanding, that Christ may improperly be called our Surety, because hee did of his own accord undertake the combate with Sathan, and his Instruments, for our redemption; and by his constant patience and obedience to the death, he overcame them all, and at last in the perfection of his obedience he made his soul a sacrifice, by which he obtained the prize, even the Redemption of all the Elect; and thus hee broke the Devils Head-plot as our voluntary Surety, but this kind of voluntary Surety, is as far distant from Mr. *Nortons* legal Surety as a free Redeemer, is from a delinquent Surety.

8 Hence it follows also, that in *Grotius* judgement, there is

is a very wide difference between a Surety for mony-matters, and a Surety in criminal cases; but these kinds of Sureties are confounded by Mr. *Norton* without distinction, or else hee would never have brought the instance of *Pauls* ingaging to *Philemon*, verse 18. to exemplifie Christs obligation to his punishments. Philemon v. 18.

9 Hence it follows, That though a man may lay down his life for others, as voluntary Sureties, in divers cases (as Mr. *Weems* shews in his four Degenerations, page 358. yet not as legal bounden Sureties.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 223.

The Doctrine of Imputation, is not a doctrine of late dayes only; The Reader that pleaseth, may bee fully satisfied by the labours of Grotius, *who at the end of his defence of the Catholick Faith, concerning the satisfaction of Christ, against* Socinus, *hath gathered together the Testimonies of many of the Ancients still extant to this purpose, from* Irenæus, Anno Christ. 180. *unto* Bernard, *who lived* 1120.

Reply 6. I cannot but wonder that Mr. *Norton* doth cite *Grotius*, and the Testimonies of the Ancient Divines for the defence of his kind of legal imputation, seeing they differ from him, as much as truth doth from error.

Mr. *Anthony Wotton* doth learnedly dispute against that kind of imputation which Mr. *Norton* holds, and yet hee doth approve of that kind of imputation which the Ancient Divines held. *De Recon. pec. part. 2. l. 1. c. 18. Sect.* 10.

If (saith he) any man say, That by accounting Christ a sinner, they mean no more, but that God deals with him, as if he did account him to be a sinner (this, though it be true, would not avail them; for thereby they overthrow the foundation that they laid, That Christ could not be a sacrifice for sin, except hee were first made guilty of our sins) such an imputation of our sins to Christ, I think no Divine will deny: I am sure (saith hee) it hath warrant enough from the Fathers.

And in Sect. 11. he cites some of the Fathers speaking thus, He suffered him to be condemned as a sinner, and to dye as one

accurſed; *For curſed is every one that hangeth on a Tree.* Chryſoſt. *in* Homil. 11. on 2 Cor.5.21. and *Theophilact* on 2 *Cor.*5. 21. ſaith, He made him ſubject to death for us, and to dye, as if hee had been a notorious offender.

Iſa.53.12. And (ſaith he) in Sect. 12. Other imputation than this I find none in the Scripture; for whereas it is ſaid in *Iſa.*53.12. *Hee was numbred with the Tranſgreſſors.* This doth *Mark* expound of his bodily death at the time of his crucifying, and it ſheweth mens dealing with him, and not Gods opinion of him: And with him they crucified two Theeves, the one on his right hand, and the other on his left; and the Scripture was fulfilled which ſaith, *And he was numbred with the Tranſgreſſors,* Mar.15.27,28 Mark.15.27,28.

And (ſaith he) in Sect.13. Neither can any man find any other imputation in the writings of the Ancient Divines, than that hee took on him to expiate for our ſins, by his blood and ſacrifice according to 1 *Pet.*2.24.*Heb.*10.10. Therefore wee may conclude, that our bleſſed Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, might bee a ſacrifice for ſin, or dye as a ſinner, although our ſins were not ſo imputed to him, that God accounted him to be guilty of them.

And (ſaith he) in Sect.14. This alſo may yet further appear, becauſe his ſacrifice was ſuch as might bee without ſuch imputation; for it was the price of our Redemption, as I ſhewed in *part.*1 *lib.*2.*cap.*10.*n.*5,6. But there may well be, and ordinarily is, Redemption by a price, without any kind of imputation; And you may alſo ſee what hee ſpeaks further to this point in Sect.7.

In theſe words of Mr. *Wotton*, the Judicious may pleaſe to take notice, that Mr. *Wotton* doth confidently affirm theſe two things:

1 That there is no other imputation of ſin to Chriſt in all the Scripture, than ſuch as he hath cited out of *Chryſoſtome* and *Theophilact.*

2 That no man can find any other imputation in the writings of the Ancient Fathers.

3 Let me adde this Teſtimony of Mr. *Wotton*, both from my own knowledge, and from the teſtimony of other eminent Chriſtians, that Mr. *Wotton* was a man of approved integrity, one

one that suffered much for Christ, through the iniquity of the times, a man of great reading in all kind of Writers, both Ancient and Modern, and a man of deep judgement; And his book of Reconciliation, was printed in his old age, after much debate, and study, and revising; and therefore what hee saith in this point of Imputation, ought not, and will not bee slighted of the Judicious. The wise will understand.

4 Hence it follows, That the Reader that pleaseth, may yet bee more fully satisfied by the labours of *Grotius*, that this affirmation of Mr. *Wottons* is a manifest truth, namely, That our sins were no otherwise imputed to Christ, but as hee bare our punishments in his body on the Tree, according to 1 Pet. 2. 24.

5 Hence it follows, That *Grotius* had good reason to produce such testimonies from the Ancient Divines against *Socinus*, because (as I perceive by several Writers) *Socinus* denied Christs sufferings to belong to the meritorious cause of Christs satisfaction.

6 On the other hand, I do also beleeve that *Grotius* did as much oppose Mr. *Nortons* kind of imputation, as hee did *Socinus* Tenents; for I have shewed in my former Reply, that *Grotius* held the obligation to legal punishments to arise from merit, and that merit is personal. Secondly, It is further evident, that *Grotius* did oppose Mr. *Nortons* kind of imputation, because hee doth oppose the imputation of Christs righteousnesse in the formal cause of our justification; for thus hee saith, The righteousnesse which they call imputative, the meer devices of men are thrust upon us, instead of divine Dictates: And (saith hee) in his War and Peace, The death of Christ was not determined by any Law, but by a special Covenant; But Mr. *Norton* holds, that both the Incarnation, and the Death of Christ, was legal obedience, quite contrary to *Grotius*.

Grotius in his Appendix to God, and his Providence, *p.* 87. 96. and in his War & Peace *part.* 1. *ch.* 36.

These things considered, I cannot but stand and wonder what Mr. *Norton* will now say to *Grotius*; surely if he will still hold to *Grotius*, then hee must first renounce his own Tenents, for *Grotius* doth fully overthrow both Mr. *Nortons* comparative Arguments, cited in the beginning of this Chapter.

The imputation of our sins to Christ, as it is asserted by Mr. *Norton*, is a doctrine but of late dayes.

7 Hence also it followeth, that the imputation of our sins to Christ, as it is asserted by Mr. *Norton*, is a Doctrine but of late dayes (though now it is grown somewhat common) for as it is affirmed by Mr. *Wotton*, it was not known in the dayes of the Ancient Fathers, and the Discourse from *Grotius* formerly cited, affirms as much. But I will leave the Judicious to inquire, further both into the antiquity and verity of it, that so the truth may be preserved to succeeding generations.

8 The Dialogue doth reason thus:

If you say, that God made Christ to bee sin for us, by imputing our sins to him; Then from the same kind of phrase you must also say, that Christ made himself sin, by imputing the guilt of all our sins to himself; for *Isaiah* doth tell us, that hee set, made, or put himself, to bee *Asham*, a Guilt, or a Trespasse for us, so the Hebrew Text doth speak in *Isa.* 53. 10. or as the Septuagint translate it, *He made himself to be sin for us*; and therefore it follows by the like consequence from this phrase, that hee must in like sort, in a judicial way, inflict upon himself all the curses of the Law, that are due to our sins and trespasses.

To this comparative Argument drawn from the likenesse of the phrase, Mr. *Norton* doth thus answer in page 55.

God charged Christ with sin as the supreme Lawgiver and judge; Christ accepts the charge of a Surety, and so subjects himself to the satisfaction of justice, which is the part of a Surety, but doth not execute that justice which is the part of a Judge.

Christ did impute our sins to himself to make himself a guilty sinner as much as ever his Father did.

Reply 7. And why doth not Christ execute that vindicative justice upon himself (that is the part of a supreme Judge) as well as his Father, seeing hee doth impute our sins to himself, by the same phrase cited, as much as the Father doth?

But the judicious Reader may soon see that Mr. *Nortons* answer is but an evasion to the Dialogues Argument.

For the Dialogue in the margent saith thus; Christ did impute all our sins and trespasses to himself as much as ever the Father did; for *Isaiah* doth tell us, That he set, or put himself to be *Asham*, a Tres-

a Treſpaſſe, or a guilt for us, or to be ſin for us, as the Septuagint render it, and hence the Dialogue doth make this comparative Argument; If God made Chriſt to bee ſin for us by imputing all our ſins and treſpaſſes to him as the obligation to his ſuffering of our curſe from Gods vindicative wrath; then from the ſame kind of phraſe it doth neceſſarily follow, that Chriſt made himſelf to be *Aſham*, a Treſpaſſe, a guilt, or ſin, by his legal imputing of our ſins to himſelf; and ſo by the ſame rule of Court-juſtice, hee muſt likewiſe in a judicial way inflict the eſſential torments of Hell upon himſelf from his vindicative wrath.

Mr. *Norton* makes no anſwer to this Argument, but inſtead thereof hee ſaith, That Chriſt accepts the charge as a Surety, but did not execute that juſtice which is the part of a Judge; but any man may ſee that by the force of the Argument in the Dialogue, that Chriſt muſt impute ſin to himſelf, and inflict the curſe as much as his Father; or in caſe an anſwer can bee found to excuſe Chriſt from this vindicative act of juſtice, then the ſame anſwer will excuſe the Father from the ſaid legal imputation of our ſins, and from his vindicative act of juſtice alſo; But if this phraſe, *God made him to be ſin*, doth argue that God made Chriſt a guilty ſinner by his imputation; then this phraſe, Chriſt made himſelf to be ſin, will argue that Chriſt made himſelf to be a guilty ſinner by his own imputation, and then hee muſt execute as a ſupreme Judge his own vindicative wrath upon himſelf, as well as the Father.

This abſurd conſequence ſaith the Dialogue, you cannot avoid; And thus ſaith the Dialogue, by this kind of arguing you make Chriſt to be his own ſelf Accuſer, and his own ſelf Executioner.

But the truth is, ſaith the Dialogue, Chriſt did no otherwiſe make himſelf to be a Treſpaſſe, a guilt, or ſin, but as hee made himſelf to be a Treſpaſſe-offering, and a Sin-offering, by which offering once for all, he ended Treſpaſſe (offerings) and finiſhed Sin (offerings) and thereby made Reconciliation for iniquity (or reconciled God to beleeving ſinners) and ſo brought in (or procured) an eternal Righteouſneſſe, inſtead of the Ceremonial ſanctifications, or juſtifications, which ſerved to the purifying of the fleſh, *Dan.* 9. 29.

SECT.

SECT. IV.

I Find also that other eminent Divines do agree with Mr. *Wotton*, and with the Ancient Divines afore cited, touching the manner how Christ was made sin for us.

See *Tindals* Works in *p.* 449. and *Frith* in *p.* 134.

1 That blessed Martyr *Tindal* saith, That in *Exod.* 29. and in *Lev.* 8. and almost every where (saith he) The Beast offered for sin, is called Sin; which use of speaking (saith hee) *Paul* useth in *Rom.* 8 3. and in 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. he calleth Christ Sin, when Christ is neither sin, nor sinful, but an acceptable sacrifice for sin; and yet (saith he) he is called our sin, because he bare our sins on his back, and because our sins are consumed, and made no sins through him, If wee forsake our sins, and beleeve in Christ for the remission thereof.

And saith he on *Rom.* 8. 3. Sin is taken for a Sin-offering after the use of the Hebrew tongue: And saith hee in page 160. Christ is no sinner, but a satisfaction, and an offering for sin: And saith hee, in page 439. Consider and mark how the Kid or Lamb must bee without spot or blemish, and so onely was Christ of all mankind in the sight of God, and of his Law.

Mark this last sentence, in the sight of God, and of his Law; this is point blank against Mr. *Nortons* Tenent, as by the places cited out of him in Chapter 6. may bee soon seen.

2 *John Frith*, and Dr. *Barns*, whose works are joyned to *Tindal*, have no other imputation of sin to Christ, but his voluntary taking of our punishments, according to Mr. *Wotton*, and the Ancient Fathers.

3 *Frith* cites *Fulgentius de fide*, thus, In those carnal sacrifices in the time of the Law, was a signification of the flesh of Christ, which hee without sin should offer for our sins.

4 *Marbeck* in his Common places, saith, that *Austin* did well say, *sed nostra delicta sua delicta fecit, ut suam justitiam nostram justitiam faceret*, that is, saith hee, by way of Paraphrase, he was counted and deemed as a sinner, because that in his unjust suffering, hee might justly save sinners that beleeve in him. And saith

In his Com. pl. p 1026.

saith he, the most part of the learned Expositors bee of this mind, and he doth not paraphrase on *Austins* words, as some do, in relation to Mr. *Nortons* Tenent, but in relation to the sense of the ancient Divines.

5 *Jerom* in 2 *Cor.* 5. saith, The Father made Christ, who knew no sin, to bee sin for us; that is, as the sacrifice for sin, is called sin in the Law (as it is written in *Leviticus*, *He shall lay his hand upon the head of his sin*) so Christ being offered for our sins took the name of sin.

6 *Primasius* gives the same exposition on 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. that *Jerom*, and divers others of the Fathers do, and that exposition is the right exposition of 2 *Cor.* 5. 21.

But others both of the ancient and latter Divines say, He was made sin by suffering our punishments, as *Chrysostome* and *Theophilact* before cited by Mr. *Wotton* on 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. but if this exposition had been placed to 1 *Pet.* 2. 24. it had been fitter there; yet there is the lesse fault to be found in placing it to 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. because the Doctrine is sound and good.

These two wayes do the Ancient Divines say, That Christ was made sin.

First, as he was made a sacrifice for sin.

And secondly, as hee suffered our punishments in his body on the Tree; but they do no where make him guilty of our sins by Gods judicial imputation, but by the Devils cunning, sin was imputed to him, for he was counted among transgressors, *Mar.* 15. 28.

7 Saith *Austin*, Christ had the similitude of sinful flesh, because his flesh was mortal, but utterly without any sin, that by sin for similitude hee might condemn the sin which is in our flesh through our iniquity; true iniquity in Christ, there was none, mortality, there was; Christ took not our sin unto him, he took the punishment of our sin, and taking the punishment without our fault (or guilt) hee healed both the punishment and the fault. See also in *Austin* cited in Chap. 15. *De verbis Ap. Ser.* 14.

8 Saith *Cyril*, Him that knew no sin, God the Father made to be sin for us: We do not say (saith hee) that Christ was made a sinner, God forbid; Mark, that hee puts a God forbid upon such a speech. In his Epist. *ad Acacium de capro Emissario.*

9 Saith Dr. *Williams*, Christ took all our blamelesse infirmities, In his seven Candlesticks, p. 353.

mities, and not our sinful infirmities; but *Luther* saith hee, makes him the greatest Theef, &c. It is better (saith hee) to cover his nakednesse as *Sem* and *Japhet* did *Noahs*, then disclose it in *Gaib* &c. But Mr. *Norton* is of a contrary judgement; for in page 92. hee doth publish *Luthers* broad expressions of imputing our personal sins to Christ with high commendations, because it suits so well to his Tenent; and so doth Dr. *Crispes* Sermons on 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. agree well to Mr. *Nortons* imputation; for saith hee, the Apostles meaning is, that no transgressor in the world was such a transgressor as Christ was, Hast thou been, saith he, an Idolater, a Blasphemer, a Murderer, an Adulterer, a Theef, a Liar, a Drunkard, &c. if thou hast part in Christ, all these transgressions of thine are become actually the transgressions of Christ, and so cease to be thine.

Also another book of great esteem, called, The Sum of Divinity, set forth by *John Downeme* in page 317. doth distinguish between sin and guilt, and yet at last hee concludes as Mr. *Norton* doth, That God did impute both these to Christ; First, Our sins; And secondly, Our guilt: And for the proof of this, he cites 2 *Cor.* 5. 21.

Do not these things speak aloud to all that love the truth in sincerity, to look better to the exposition of this, and other Scriptures? It is recorded that one *Augustinus de Roma*, Archbishop of *Nazaret*, was censured in the Council of *Basil* (and that justly, as I conceive) for affirming that Christ was *peccatorum maximus*, the greatest of sinners.

10 Let *Peter Martyr* shew his judgement how Christ was in the similitude of sinful flesh, in *Rom.* 8. 3. It means nothing else, saith he, but that hee was subject unto heat, cold, hunger, thirst, contumelies, and death, for these saith he, are the effects of sin; and therefore, saith hee, the flesh of Christ, might well bee called the flesh of sin (and the next sentence runs thus) *Christ condemned sin in the flesh of sin*; that is (saith he) by that oblation which was for sin. * Sin (saith hee) after the Hebrew manner of speaking, is a sacrifice for sin; and saith he, that exposition which we brought of the sacrifice for sin, is agreeable to other Testimonies of Scripture; for *Isaiah* writing of Christ, saith, If hee shall put his soul, sin, that is, for sin, *Isa.* 53. 10. and so he which knew no sin, was made sin for us, 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. Thus far

* Sin in Rom. 8. 3. is exponnded a sacrifice for sin, by *Origen*, *Melanther*, *Bucer*, *Calvin*, *Pererius* and *Vatablus*.

ſay *Peter Martyr*. And as yet I can find no other imputation in *Peter Martyr*, but ſuch as the ancient Fathers held, namely, that Chriſt took our ſins upon him, meaning our puniſhments in his body on the Tree, according to 1 *Pet.* 2. 24.

11 *Gregory* ſaith, The Lord coming in fleſh, neither took on him our fault by any infection, nor our puniſhment by any co-action, for being defiled with no ſtain of ſin, he could not bee held by any condition of our guiltineſſe, therefore treading all neceſſity under his feet, of his own accord, when hee would, hee admitted our death. *In moralium l.* 24. *c.* 2.

In theſe words hee ſaith plainly, that Chriſt was no way guilty of our ſins, as the obligation to his death and ſufferings, but that hee admitted death from the voluntary cauſe only. He doth point blank oppoſe Mr. *Nortons* Tenent.

Ibidem, We all dye againſt our wills, becauſe we are tyed to the debt of induring puniſhment by the condition of our ſin; but he that was intangled with no fault, could not bee bound to any penalty by neceſſity, yet becauſe he ſubdued our ſin by reigning over it, in mercy and pity to us, hee undertook our puniſhment, as himſelf ſaith, *I have power to lay down my ſoul, no man taketh it from me, I have power to lay it down of my ſelf.*

In theſe words hee contradicts Mr. *Nortons* kind of imputation, as if he had purpoſely directed his ſpeech againſt him.

12 Of our two deaths (ſaith *Bernard*) whereof one was the deſert of ſin (namely our ſpiritual death in ſin) the other the due puniſhment (namely bodily death, as the puniſhment of original ſin) Chriſt taking our puniſhment, but clear from ſin, whiles hee dyed willingly, and only in body, hee meriteth for us life and righteouſneſſe. *Ad militis Templi c.* 11.

Hee writes againſt Mr. *Nortons* imputation of guilt as the obligation to Chriſts ſuffering Hell-torments, as if hee had ſeen his book.

Ibidem, Had not Chriſt dyed voluntarily, his death (ſaith he) had not been meritorious; how much more unworthily hee dyed, that had not deſerved death, ſo much more juſtly (man) liveth for whom he dyed; what juſtice, thou wilt ask, is this, That an Innocent ſhould dye for a Malefactor? It is no juſtice,

it is mercy; if it were juſtice, then ſhould hee not dye freely, but indebted thereto; and if indebted, then indeed hee ſhould dye, but the other for whom hee dyed ſhould not live; yet though it bee not juſtice, it is not againſt juſtice, otherwiſe he could not bee both juſt and merciful.

If the Reader pleaſe but to review the ſeveral ſpeeches of Mr. *Norton* about the imputation of our ſins to Chriſt, as I have ſet them down in the ſixth Chapter, and compare them with theſe words of *Bernard*, he may ſee as direct an oppoſition as is poſſible.

Hence I conclude, That the ancient Divines from *Irenæus* to *Bernard*, which is neer a thouſand yeers ſpace, were unacquainted with Mr. *Nortons* kind of imputing our ſins to Chriſt, to make him guilty of his death and ſufferings; and therefore his kind of imputation is a doctrine but of late dayes.

SECT. V.

The ſecond thing to bee examined in 2 Cor. 5. 21. *is touching the word Righteouſneſſe, which Mr.* Norton *in his comparative Argument, doth make to be the Righteouſneſſe of Chriſt.*

BUt I have already ſhewed, that this word Righteouſneſſe, is not meant of Chriſts Righteouſneſſe, but of God the Fathers Righteouſneſſe, for God the Father is righteous in keeping Covenant with Chriſt the Mediator for the reconciliation of ſinners, as well as Chriſt was righteous in performing the Covenant on his part, which was to make his ſoul a ſacrifice for their reconciliation.

The Covenant between the Trinity was to redeem the Elect from Sathans Head-plot. Chriſt undertook the office of a Mediatorial Prieſt.

Gods forgiveneſſe, is the formal cauſe of a ſinners righteouſneſſe.

Firſt, to combate with Sathan.

And ſecondly, to make his ſoul a ſacrifice of reconciliation, and the performance of this is called his Righteouſneſſe in *Rom.* 5. 18. And ſecondly, God the Father covenanted to bee reconciled, and ſo to pardon the ſins of the Elect as ſoon as they are in Chriſt; and his performance of this, is here called,

The

The Righteousneſſe of God the Father. And thirdly, The Holy Ghoſt covenanted to unite the Elect unto Chriſt, that ſo they might bee the fit ſubjects of the ſaid Righteouſneſſe.

2 I grant, that the righteouſneſſe of God may bee diſtinguiſhed into many other ſenſes, as Mr. *Wotton* hath ſhewed, *de Reconcil. pec. part.* 2. *l.* 2. *c.* 20. *n.* 3. which ſeveral ſenſes muſt bee conſidered according to the context in each place where it is uſed; but in this place, Gods reconciling the world to himſelf, by not imputing their ſins to them, as it is expreſſed in verſe 19. is called the righteouſneſſe of God in this 21. verſe; becauſe it is the performance of his condition with the Mediator, for the compleating of a ſinners righeouſneſſe that is in Chriſt.

The Reconciliation mentioned (ſaith Mr. *Ball*) in 2 *Cor.* 5. 19. is explained by the non-imputation, or remiſſion of ſins; at leaſt (ſaith he) it is one part or branch of Reconciliation, which is a tranſient act conferred in time, and inferreth a change of ſtate and condition in the party juſtified, or reconciled, and of other reconciliation betwixt God and man, the Scripture ſpeaketh not. *Ball* on the Covenant, p. 219.

In theſe words the Reader may pleaſe to take notice, that Mr. *Ball* doth make the non-imputation of ſin to be all one with juſtification, in the party juſtified or reconciled; and ſo hee makes juſtification to bee the firſt part or branch of reconciliation, as Mr. *Wotton* doth.

And ſaith Mr. *Ball* in page 219. The Apoſtle in *Rom.* 5. 9, 10. puts reconciliation by the death of the Son of God, and juſtification by Chriſts blood, for the ſame thing merited by Chriſts ſacrifice. Rom. 5. 9, 10.

Theſe obſervations out of Mr. *Ball* may adviſe us, that Gods righteouſneſſe procured by the Sin-ſacrifice of Chriſt, in v. 21. is the ſame, or at leaſt a branch of the ſame reconciliation of God, which the Apoſtle hath defined in verſe 19. by his not imputing ſin, and the performance of that reconciliation, or non-imputation of ſins on Gods part, for the ſake of Chriſts Sin-ſacrifice, is called the righteouſneſſe of God the Father, in this 21. verſe; and this expoſition of the righteouſneſſe of God, any indifferent Reader may ſee to be cleerly meant by the context, though I ſhould ſay no more. But I will yet further evi-

evidence, that this expoſition of Gods righteouſneſſe, is no new-upſtart expoſition, but that it hath the concurrence, and countenance of other eminent orthodox Divines.

1 *Peter Martyr* in *Rom.* 10. 3. ſaith thus:

Now reſteth to ſee what is the righteouſneſſe of God, and it may thus be defined.

It is an Abſolution from ſins, by faith, through Chriſt.

And (ſaith he) that we may the better underſtand the nature of this Abſolution, we muſt on the other ſide weigh the nature of ſin.

Sin is a defect, or falling away, from the Law and Will of God; And to this defect is neceſſarily annexed an obligation to eternal death and damnation.

Wherefore, when by the mercy of God this obligation and guiltineſſe is taken away, A man is abſolved from his ſins.

Ibidem, Now by theſe things (ſaith he) it is manifeſt what Abſolution is, It is an action of God (the Father) whereby he delivereth and acquitteth us from ſins, that is, from guiltineſſe and obligation to eternal death.

But (ſaith he in the ſecond place) that we ſhould not think that ſo great benefit cometh through our deſert, therefore it is added, through Chriſt.

And (ſaith he in the third place) that wee ſhould not bee ignorant how the ſacrifice and redemption of Chriſt is applyed to every one of us, it is added, by faith.

This definition (ſaith he) is a great help to the right underſtanding of juſtification; and this righteouſneſſe, *Paul* ſaith, *Is the righteouſneſſe of God.*

Ibidem, And (ſaith he) the Commentaries which are aſcribed unto *Jerom*, do herein very well agree; They are not ſubject to the righteouſneſſe of God; that is (ſaith he) the abſolution of ſins.

(And leſt wee ſhould in our thoughts miſtake the true nature of this righteouſneſſe of God, whereby he makes ſinners that are in Chriſt, righteous, he gives this ſpecial caution to bee marked.)

Ibidem, By theſe things (ſaith he) let us gather that this righteouſneſſe of God is far diſtant from the righteouſneſſe the

that is known by nature; for neither Reason nor Philosophy knoweth any other Righteousnes but that which hath its abiding in the mind; not that they were ignorant of absolution, or of the pacifying of God, for that thing did their Sacrifices testifie. But this pacifying of God, they did not call our righteousnes, neither ever understood they the true pacifying of God, nor wherein it consisted.

Thus far *P. Martyr* in *Rom.* 10. 3. he had spoken of the Righteousnes of God afore this, in *Rom.* 1. 17. and in *Rom.* 3. 21. but not so clearly as here; these meditations on *Rom.* 10. 3. were his last meditations on that phrase, and therefore his best; for by this time he had the advantage of more reading and meditation to clear up his full mind and meaning. And see what he saith further of Gods Righteousnes, which I have cited in the Exposition of *Rom.* 3. 26.

Secondly, *Mr. Norton, de Reconc. pec. par.* 2. *l.* 1. *c.* 20. saith at Sect. 4. That 2 *Cor.* 5. 21, doth comprehend the same Righteousnes, which the Apostle may well say, is the end or effect of the oblation of Christ; The Righteousnes of God. And (saith he) it comprehends the righteousnes which may be required to the justification of a sinner. And in Sect. 5. (saith he) in the second place, I answer, That the righteousnes of God in the places alleged, may fitly & rightly enough be expounded of remission of sins; for it is plain enough (saith he) that in all these places is handled the formal cause of Justification, which (saith he) I have taught is contained in Remission of sins, *in par.* 1. *l.* 2. *c.* 17. But remission of sins may well be called the righteousnes of God, because it is a righteousnes approved by God. And indeed *Calv. Justi. l.* 3. *c.* 11. *n.* 9. doth so interpret the righteousnes of God, to be a righteousnes that is approved of God.

Thirdly, *Mr. Bale* on the Covenant, in p. 72. calls the righteousnes of God in *Phil* 3. 9. and in 1 *Cor.* 5. 21. the remission of sins. By the Righteousnes of God (saith he) understand remission of sins, and regeneration; and consider what he saith in the place immediately cited.

Fourthly, *Sedulius*, in *Rom.* 3. 21. calls the Righteousnes of God (there) the remission of sins.

Fifthly, *Tindal* doth thus open the Righteousnes of God, in

Rom. 10. 3. See Tindals works, p. 381.

in *Rom.* 10-3. The Jews (saith he) were not obedient to the Justice or Righteousness that commeth of God, which is the forgiveness of sin in Christs blood, to all that repent and beleeve,

And (saith he) in p. 30. By reason of which false righteousness, they were disobedent to the Righteousnesse of God; which (saith he) is the forgiveness of sin in Christs blood.

And *Tindal* in his Prologue to the *Romans* shews first, How we are justified by the Righteousness of God the Father. Secondly, How we are justified by the Righteousness of Christ. Thirdly, How we are justified by Faith. And in all these he speaks just according to the sense expressed in the Dialogue.

1 (Saith he) When I say God justifieth us, understand thereby, that for Christ his sake, merit, and deservings onely, he receiveth us unto his Mercy, Favor, and Grace, and forgiveth us our sins.

2 (Saith he) When I say Christ justifieth, understand thereby that Christ onely hath redeemed us, and brought and delivered us out of the wrath of God, and damnation, and with his works onely hath purchased us the favor of God, and the forgiveness of sins.

3 When I say that Faith justifieth, understand thereby that faith and trust in the Truth of God, and in the Mercy promised us for Christs sake, and for his deservings onely, doth quiet the conscience, and certifie her that our sins are forgiven, and we in full favor of God.

In his works, p. 187.

And in p. 187. he abreviates the speeches thus,

The faith (saith he) of true beleevers, is, First, That God justifieth or forgiveth. Secondly, That Christ deserveth it. Thirdly, That Faith and trust in Christs blood receiveth it, and certifieth the conscience thereof.

And in p. 225. he doth again repeat it thus, God doth justifie actively, that is to say, forgiveth us for full righteous. 2. Christs love deserveth it, And 3. Faith in the Promises receiveth it, and certifieth the conscience thereof.

Thus you see that *Tindal* doth fully express himself in the very sense of the Dialogue. And this Doctrine hath been generally received of the godly in the days of King *Henry* the eighth, and

and in the days of King *Edward* the Sixth, by the generality of the learned, and it hath been often printed, not onely in his Books, but also in his Bible, in his Prologue to the *Romans*, and it hath been transcribed and printed by *Marbeck* in his Common places; though now this antient received Truth, is by Mr. *Norton* and some few others counted both for novelty and heresie.

And thus have I shewed from five eminent Orthodox Divines, that the Righteousnes of God the Father to sinners, is nothing else but his reconciliation, as it is defined by the Apostle, by not imputing sin, in v. 19. which is also called the Righteousnes of God, in ver. 21. And therefore it follows necessarily, that the true sense of the one and twentieth verse, according to the context, is this,

1 That God the Father (from the voluntary cause and Covenant) made, or constituted, Christ to be a Sin Sacrifice for us; namely, to procure Gods Reconciliation for us.

2 That the performance of the said Sin-Sacrifice is in *Rom.* 5. 18. called *Dicaioma* (not *Dicaiosune*) the righteousnes of Christ, because it was his obedience to Gods positive Law and Covenant, and not because it was his moral obedience, as Mr. *Norton* doth mis-interpret it in p. 230. Rom. 5. 18.

3 That God the Father did Covenant on his part, to and with Christ, that for his Sin-Sacrifice sake, he would be reconciled to sinners (as soon as they are in Christ by Faith) by not imputing their sins to them; and this performed on God the Fathers part, is by the Apostle called the righteousnes of God, because he performs according to his positive Law and Covenant; and by this righteousnes of God, he is reconciled to all beleeving sinners, and so by this means they are thereby made fully righteous in his sight.

4 From the said righteousnes of Christ to Gods positive Law in making his soul a Sin-Sacrifice, it follows, That as by one mans disobedience to Gods meer positive Law in eating the forbidden fruit, the many (as well as the Reprobates) are made sinners by the meritorious cause of his disobedience; So by the obedience of one (namely of Christ) to a meer positive Law in undertaking to combate with Satan, and to continue obedient to the death of the cross, and at last to make his Soul a Rom. 5. 19.

Sacrifice, the many are made righteous, *Rom.* 5. 19. for by this obedience of his to the said positive Law and Covenant, he hath merited not onely their conversion by the Holy Ghost, but also the Fathers reconciliation for their justification, by not imputing their sins to them. So then the comparison that is made between the first *Adam* and the second, lies in the meritorious cause; for as the first *Adam* merited the death of sin to all his posterity, by his disobedience to Gods positive Law and Covenant; so the second *Adam* merited the life of Gods Spirit, and of Gods forgiveness, by his obedience to Gods positive Law, in making his soul a sacrifice.

5 Hence it also follows, that the obedience of Christ to the moral Law, is not here spoken of, namely, not in *Rom.* 5. 18, 19. and accordingly Mr. *Wotton*, Mr. *Forbs*, and divers other eminent Divines, do expound ver. 18, and 19. to relate onely to his positive righteousnes in his death and sacrifice, and not to his moral obedience, no otherwise but as it made him to be a Lamb without spot or blemish, fit for sacrifice; And therefore Mr. *Nortons* proof of Heresie from *Rom.* 5. 19. in p. 268. doth fail him, as well as all his other proofs.

Rom. 3. 25. 6 My former Expositon of Gods righteousnes to be his reconciliation in not imputing sin, is further evident by the words of the Apostles *in terminis*, in *Rom.* 3. 25. *To declare his righteousnes for the remission of sins that are past.* For the better understanding of the sense of these words, I will propound these three Questions and Answers.

First, Whose righteousnes doth the Apostle say is here declared, but God the Fathers?

Secondly, Wherein is God the Fathers righteousnes declared, but by the remission of sins that are past?

Thirdly, How else doth God declare this righteousnes of his by remission, but by setting forth Christ to be his propitiatory (or his Mercy-Seat) through faith in his blood? And thus you see that this Text doth *in terminis* make Gods righteousnes consist in remission of sins, as I have expounded 2 *Cor.* 5. 21.

Dan. 9. 24. 7 *Daniel* doth make Gods righteousnes whereby he makes sinners righteous, to consist in his reconciliation by not imputing sin, in *Dan.* 9. 24. he saith that Christ by his death was to finish

finiſh Treſpaſs (offerings) and to end Sin (offerings) and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in an everlaſting righteouſneſs. Mark this, his death and ſacrifice was to procure Gods reconciliation for iniquity; and this reconciliation, he calls, an everlaſting righteouſneſs to ſinners. And thus you ſee that *Daniel* doth make Gods reconciliation to be an everlaſting righteouſneſs to beleeving ſinners, as I have expounded 2 *Cor.*5.21.

8 *David* doth alſo confirm this expoſition of Gods righteouſneſs, in *Pſal.*51.14. *Deliver me from blood guiltineſs, O God,* Pſal.51.14. *then my tongue ſhall ſing aloud of thy righteouſneſs.*

Firſt, How elſe doth he mean that God ſhould deliver him from his bloodguiltineſs, but by his reconciliation, in not imputing that ſin to his condemnation? according to that deſire and prayer, in *Deut.*21.8.

Secondly, What righteouſneſs of God doth he elſe mean, that his tongue ſhould ſing aloud of, but Gods Attonement in not imputing his blood-guiltineſs to him, for the ſake of Chriſts Sin-Sacrifice?

Thus you ſee that the Expoſition given of Gods righteouſneſs in 2 *Cor.*5.21. and ſo conſequently of the ſame term in *Rom.*3.21,22,25,26. and in *Rom.*10.3. and in *Phil.*3.9. is confirmed and ſtrengthened by an eight-fold cord, which I beleeve Mr. *Norton* will not be able to break.

But Mr. *Norton* in p.260. ſtumbles at the Dialogue becauſe it follows Mr. *Wotton* in making Juſtification and Adoption to be the two parts of Gods Attonement or Reconciliation.

And at laſt in p.262. he opens himſelf thus:

But whether Juſtification preciſely conſidered, be a part of, or a neceſſary antecedent or means of reconciliation, it is freely left to the judgement of the Reader: But (ſaith he) *the* Leiden *Divines ſay, it is rather a conſequent and effect of Juſtification. And when he concludes, that the Analogy of Faith may as well bear an interpretation agreeable hereunto, as any other, thus, God was in Chriſt reconciling the world to himſelf, How? By not imputing their treſpaſſes to them, ſo as, the not imputation of ſin* (ſaith he)

may seem to be an antecedent and means, rather than a part of Attonement, or Reconciliation,

Reply. 1. It is now apparent why Mr. *Norton* did stumble at the Dialogue, for giving two parts to Reconciliation, according to Mr. *Wotton*, It was to introduce his conjectures (quite contrary to Mr. *Wotton*) namely, that Gods non-imputation of sin is an antecedent and means, rather than a part of attonement or reconciliation. But because he expresseth himself to be somewhat uncertain in his notions in this point, therefore he cannot be thought to be a fit Judge to censure the Dialogue, nor to determine this controversie. But the Scriptures are most plain in this point, if they be not intricated by such uncertain conjectures.

1 The Scripture speaks plainly, that when the Bullock for sin was offered by the Priest to make attonement for sins of ignorance, then the promise annexed saith, *It shall be forgiven him, Levit* 4.20. Any man from hence may see plainly, that Gods forgiveness is not an antecedent, but a true part of his attonement (if it be not the whole) The like is said of the Rulers sin, in v. 26. and the like is said of the sins of any of the people, in ver. 31,35. namely, that when Gods attonement is procured by their said Sin-Sacrifice, then, thereupon their sin is said to be forgiven them.

2 The Burnt-offerings, And Thirdly, The Trespass-offerings were ordained to procure Gods gracious forgiveness, as a part of his attonement, as in *Levit.*5. 10,13,16,18. and in *Lev.*6.7. and in *Lev.*19.22. and in *Numb.*15.25,26,28. In all these places Gods promise of his forgiveness by his attonement, did openly proclaim in the ears of all *Israel*, and in the ears of all others that have ears to hear, that when Gods attonement is obtained by sacrifice, then, and not till then sin is forgiven, and then and not till then that person is actually justified; either he is ceremonially justified, as a person fit to stand before Gods holy presence in his Sanctuary, or else in case they have Faith to look from the typicall attonement to the mysticall, they shall thereby have an eternal pardon from their moral sins, and so an eternal justification in Gods sight.

Or

Or thus,

Gods Reconciliation procured by an acceptable sacrifice, is not like the Reconciliation of a Judge, that doth but barely acquit a Malefactor, and so leaves him; but it is like the Reconciliation of a merciful Father, that doth not only forgive his child, but together with that forgivenes, doth also receive him into favour; and in this sense these two terms, Gods Attonement, and his gracious forgivenes for Christs sacrifice sake, is the same thing: And thus Gods forgivenes is the whole of his Reconciliation.

3 This sense of Gods forgivenes, as it is the whole of Reconciliation, is evident by Gods promise in the New Covenant; for in *Jer.*31.34. the promise runs thus, *I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.* This promise is thus expounded in *Heb.*8.12. *I will be merciful to their unrighteousnesse, and their sins, and their iniquities will I remember no more*; the first expression, *I will be merciful*, is as much as I will bee Reconciled or Attoned to their unrighteousnes, for the Greek word ἱλεως is used by the Septuagint to express the force of the Hebrew word *Caphar* in *Deu.*21.8. and it is there used for Gods Attonement or Explation; and therefore this expression, *I will be merciful*, may as well bee translated, *I will bee pacified*, or *I will be reconciled*, or *I will be attoned to their unrighteousnes, and will remember their sins no more*; And saith *Nehemiah* 9.17. *Thou art a God of pardons, gracious, and merciful.* And hence it is plain, that Gods forgivenes is not an antecedent, or a means of Gods Attonement, but it is plainly a true part thereof, if it bee not the whole.

Heb.8.12.

Deut.21.8.

4 This is yet further evident, because the Septuagint do also use this Greek word for the Hebrew word *Nasa* in *Num.* 14.19. where it is used to express Gods forgivenes by his bearing of sin away, but the Septuagint express it by his being merciful, or pacified, or reconciled, but yet in vers.18. there the Septuagint translate *Nasa* by bearing away.

Num.14.19.

5 The Septuagint do also use this Greek word ἱλεως to express Gods repentance towards sinners, by forgiving (and not punishing) their sin, as in *Exod.*32.12. *Moses* saith thus to God, *Repent of the evil to thy people*, but the Septuagint translate it be merciful, or bee pacified, or bee reconciled, or bee propitious

to the evill of thy people, alluding in this expression to Gods Propitiatory or Mercy-seat where (in type) God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, by not imputing their sins to them, as I have opened the Hebrew word *Caphar*, more at large in *Reply* 9.

6 This kind of forgivenes for the sake of Christs sacrifice, doth con-note a state of favour that the subject is put into by means thereof, *Psal.* 32. 1. as reconciliation and justification doth in 2 *Cor.* 5. 19, 21. and therefore Gods forgivenes, may well be called his merciful forgivenes, or his reconciled forgivenes, as Mr. *Ainsworth* doth open Gods forgivenes in *Psal.* 25. 11. and therefore it is not an antecedent, but a concurrent part of Gods Reconciliation, or of Gods Righteousnesse, for they have but one and the same sense by the context in 2 *Cor.* 5. 19, 21. though the terms be divers; for I demand, how else are wee made righteous by the Righteousnes of God the Father, but by his Righteousnes in keeping Covenant with Christ, which was to bee reconciled to beleeving sinners for the sake of his Sin-sacrifice in not imputing their sins to them; And thus you see that these three terms, Gods merciful forgivenes, and his Reconciliation, and his Righteousnes in making sinners righteous by his said forgivenes, do all con-note the same state of favour, that the subject is put into by means thereof, and so forgivenes is not antecedent, but concurrent to Reconcillation and Justification.

Psal. 25. 11.

7 It is yet further evident that Christ was made sin, to reconcile God withal, and so to procure his forgivenes for a sinners justification, by the Levitical terms given to the Sin-offering, as the procuring cause of Gods reconciliation; for it is often said in the Law, that God ordained the Sin-offering to reconcile withal, as in *Lev.* 6. 30. 2 *Chr.* 29. 24. *Exod.* 29. 36. *Exod.* 30. 10. *Ezek.* 45. 15, 17. *Num.* 15. 30.

Lev. 6. 30.

8 God ordained all sorts of sacrifices (as well as the Sin-offering) to procure Gods reconciliation, by not imputing sin; and therefore in this respect they are called sometimes Sacrifices of Attonement, as in *Exod.* 30. 10. and sometimes sacrifices of righteousnes, as in *Deut.* 33. 19. *Psal.* 4. 5. *Psal.* 51. 19. as I have shewed in *Reply* 7.

Deut. 33. 19. Psal. 51. 19.

And

And why else are sacrifices of Attonement called sacrifices of Righteousness, but because in their legal use they did *ex opere operato*, procure Gods reconciliation in not imputing their legal sins to them, and that was their legal righteousness? For the blood of Bulls and Goats, and the ashes of an Heifer did sanctifie to the purifying of the flesh; And hence the Apostle doth argue, How much more shall the blood of Christ be of force to procure Gods reconciliation in not imputing sin, and so to cleanse the conscience from moral sins for our eternal righteousness, and therefore answerable to the types, God ordained Christ by his positive Law and Covenant to bee our Burnt-offering, our Peace-offering, our Trespass-offering, our Meat-offering, and our Sin-offering, as the perfection of all the rest; For by his one offering once offered, hee ended the use of all Trespass (offerings) and finished Sin (offerings) and made reconciliation for iniquity, and so brought in, or procured an everlasting Righteousness, *Dan.* 9. 24. instead of their Ceremonial reconciliation, which was their Ceremonial righteousness for Gods holy presence in his Sanctuary. And to this full sense doth *Daniel* speak in his prayer, *Dan.* 9. 7. *O Lord, Righteousness belongeth unto thee*, that is to say, merciful forgiveness, or reconciliation; and in vers. 16. *O Lord, according to all thy righteousness, let thine anger be turned away*: But the Septuagint render it, *O Lord, according to thy mercy, let thine anger be turned away*; namely, according to all thy accustomed types of making humbled and beleeving sinners righteous by thy merciful forgiveness, and Attonement; Let thine anger bee turned away, and justifie us to bee thy people by not imputing our sins to us; and in this sense the penitent Publican said, *O Lord, be merciful to me a sinner*; and so hee went away justified by Gods merciful attonement, and forgiveness, which was the very thing he prayed for. Dan. 9. 24. Dan. 9. 7, 16.

9 Sin, till it is forgiven, doth cause an enmity between God and the sinner, and till God is reconciled by the Sacrifice of Christ (it continues the enmity, but) then, and not till then, sin is forgiven; and then, and not till then, God is at rest, and is pacified and quieted: And for this cause all Sacrifices of Attonement were ordained to procure

cure a savour of a rest unto Jehovah, *Exod.* 22. 18, 25, 41. *Levit.* 1. 9. *Numb.* 28, 6, 8. *Levit.* 4. 31. *Levit.* 17. 6. *Numb.* 15. 3. *Ezek.* 20. 40, 41. But the Septuagint translate it, A sweet savour of rest, and their phrase the Apostle followeth, saying, *Christ hath given himself for us an offering, and a sacrifice to God, for a smell of sweet savour*, Eph. 5. 2. But the smell of Sacrifices broyled in the fire, materially considered, was no sweet smell; but formally considered, as they were ordained by Gods positive Covenant, to procure his Attonement, and as they were types of Christs Sacrifice, so only are they said to bee of a sweet-smelling savour, because they procure his pardon, and so they quiet Gods Spirit, as sweet smels do quiet and rejoyce our senses, therefore Gods forgiveness is not an antecedent or means of Attonement, but a concurrent part of Attonement.

These Reasons (besides what others may bee added) do sufficiently prove, That Gods gracious forgiveness for the sake of Christs sacrifice, is not an antecedent, but a true part (if it bee not the whole) of Gods Reconciliation.

And secondly, These Reasons do prove, That it is Gods righteousness to grant his reconciliation to all beleeving sinners for the sake of Christs sacrifice for their formal and eternal righteousness.

And thirdly, Hence it follows, that Mr. *Norton's* conjectures, that reconciliation is but a consequent of justification, is fallen to the ground.

8 This Righteousness of God being thus explained; It necessarily follows, That such as hold Gods Righteousness in being reconciled to sinners (for the satisfaction sake of Christs Sin-sacrifice) to bee the formality of a sinners righteousness, must needs deny the imputation of Christs moral righteousness to bee the formal cause of a sinners justification.

SECT.

SECT. VI.

BUt Mr. *Norton* in p. 268. Doth damn this formal cause for Heresie, and to make good his charge, he cites *Rom.* 5. 19. and *Phil.* 3. 9. intending thereby to prove, that the active righteousness of Christ to the moral Law, is imputed to us for our formal righteousness and justification.

Reply 2. I have but a little before given the true sense of *Rom.* 5. 19. in a differing sense from the point that Mr. *Norton* would prove by it. And secondly, I will now examine his exposition of *Phil.* 3. 9. And truly, I cannot but wonder that he should cite it to prove the righteousness of Christ as our Surety to the moral Law, seeing there is no righteousness of Christ expressed in this Text; but the righteousness expressed is plainly called the righteousness of God, namely of God the Father, just as I have opened the phrase, in 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. and therefore this righteousness of God in *Phil.* 3. 9. must have the same sense as I have expounded it to have, in 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. And thus you see, that hitherto Mr. *Nortons* proofs of Heresie have failed his expectation, and on the contrary, they do make directly against him. Phil. 3. 9.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in p. 211.

To say that pardon of sin is righteousness it self, is to confound the effect with the cause.

Reply 3. If a meer natural Philosopher had said so, it had been the less wonder, but that a learned Divine should say so, especially after so much light both from *German* and *English* Divines, that have taken pains to make it evident, that Gods gracious pardon is a sinners righteousness, is to my apprehensions somewhat strange.

This righteousness of God, saith *P. Martyr* (as I have noted him a little before) is far distant from the righteousness that is known by nature, for neither Reason nor Philosophy knoweth any other righteousness but that which hath its abiding in

the mind, not that they were ignorant of absolution, or of the pacifying of God, for that thing did their sacrifices testifie: But (saith he) this pacifying of God they did not call our righteousnesse. Hence I infer, that if Mr. *Norton* will but submit his reason to that peculiar way of justification, which God hath constituted onely for beleeving sinners by his Covenant with Christ, and by his positive Laws, then he may soon see that God hath ordained a righteousnesse for beleeving sinners, by his reconciliation onely, and not by the righteousnesse of the moral Law, as the principles of natural Reason is apt to judge, for the principles of natural reason cannot think of a righteousnesse for sinners by positive Laws, because it resteth in Gods will only to make such Laws effectual for that purpose.

Secondly, This way of making sinners righteous, is lively typified and exemplified to us, by the Jews legal justifications, as I have in part noted a little before, and also in page 110. but because it is of concernment, I will speak a little more fully to this point.

It pleased God of his good will and pleasure to covenant with *Abraham*, that his seed should be his peculiar Church and people in the land of *Canaan*, and in that respect he was pleased to set up the Tabernacle of his Divine presence among them, and set Porters at the gates of the house of the Lord, that none which was unclean in any thing should enter therein, 2 *Chron.* 23.19. And when the Jews were cleansed according to the purification of the Sanctuary, they said to the Porters, in *Psal.* 118.19. *Open to me the gates of Righteousnesse*, called the gates of Justice, saith *Ainsworth*, because onely the just and clear might enter therein, and so ver. 20. and in *Jer.* 50.7. The Temple is called the Habitation of Justice, because of their ceremonial Justice: No unclean person on pain of death might enter therein, *Levit.* 15.31. and it was once a year cleansed with the blood of the Sin-offering, *Levit.* 16.16, 20. Neither might any dare to have communion with God, in feasting on the holy flesh, in the holy City, in their legal uncleannesse, *Levit.* 7.20. *and* 22.3, 9. And to make them, and to keep them clean, God gave them not onely his Moral Law, with prohibitions of all that was contrary thereto, but also he gave them divers other positive Laws and Ordinances, for their legal justifications from all

all their ceremonial sins, yea, and from their moral sins also. *Levit.* 5. 4, 6. as to the outward man, when they were to come before Gods presence in his Sanctuary, or when they were to feast with God on the holy flesh; and in case any did presume to come in their legal uncleanesse before they were qualified according to the preparation of the Sanctuary, they were threatned to be cut off (as some of *Ephraim* were) 2 *Chron.* 30. 18, 19. *Exod.* 12. 15, 19. *Levit.* 7. 20, 21, 25, 27. *Numb.* 19. 20. And sometimes such persons are threatned with death, as I noted above from *Levit.* 15. 31. And for fear of Gods displeasure, by transgressing these positive Ordinances, all *Israel* in general, were exactly careful to observe these works of the Law (called the first Covenant, in *Heb.* 9. 1. in relation to *Heb.* 8. 7, 8.) for their justification, when they were to come into Gods holy presence in his Sanctuary, or to feast on the holy flesh; and for their exact care herein, the whole Nation (though many times there were but few that were truly godly among them) were called men of holiness, *Exod.* 22. 31. *Lev.* 11. 44. *Exod.* 19. 6. and saith *Ainsworth* in *Gen.* 17. 12. By three things did *Israel* enter into Covenant. 1. By Circumcision, 2. By Baptism, 3. By Sacrifice. And their Levitical cleansing and worship, is called the first Covenant (as I have noted it also in p. 118.) That had Ordinances or Justifications of divine service, *Heb.* 9. 1: and they are called carnal justifications, in ver. 10. as Mr. *Dickson*, Mr. *Trap*, and others, have well observed from the Greek word *Dicaiomata*; for it pleased God by his positive Laws to ordain that the blood of Bulls and Goats, and the ashes of an Heifer sprinkling the unclean, should be of force to sanctifie them, to the purifying of the flesh, *Heb.* 9. 13. namely, to justifie them from their ceremonial sins, and so to make them fit for communion with God in his Sanctuary, and in feasting with him on the holy flesh of Passeovers and Peace-offerings; and it is yet the more manifest, that this carnal cleansing did justifie them, because the Temple (as soon as it was ceremonially cleansed from the pollutions of *Antiochus*) is said in the Septuagint to be cleansed, but in the Hebrew text it is said to be justified. *Dan.* 8. 14. now it was justified no otherwise, but as it was ceremonially cleansed by carrying out the filthiness of dirt and of idols, as in 2 *Chron.* 29. 5, 15, 16, 17. and by the blood

Lev. 15. 31. Sacrifices and washings were ordained for their typical justification under the first Covenant from their ceremonial sins. Exod. 22. 31.

Heb. 9. 1, 10.

Heb 9. 13.

Dan. 8. 14.

of the Sin-offering, *Ezek.*45.18,19. *Levit.*16.16. and thus we see, that when persons and things are legally cleansed from ceremonial defilements, they are said to be justified; and therefore the blood of Bulls and Goats, and the ashes of an Heifer sprinkling the unclean under the first Covenant, to procure Gods attonement for their ceremonial justification, did but typifie our moral justification by Gods attonement, and forgivenes for the sake of the blood of Christs Sin-offering under the new Covenant, for nothing but Gods attonement, alone doth cleanse and justifie a sinner, and so the Apostle doth argue the case, in *Heb.* 9.13,14. *If* (saith he) *the blood of Buls and Goats, and the ashes of an Heifer sprinkling the unclean, did sanctifie to the purifying of the flesh*; for by this means onely they procured Gods attonement and forgivenes, for their ceremonial defilements (according to Gods appointment in the first Covenant of works) for without Gods attonement procured by the use of the said legal Rites, their flesh could not be sanctified in a fit manner for his holy presence in his Sanctuary; and in this respect the Seventy do render the word Attonement, by the word Sanctified, as you see it observed by *Ainsworth* in *Exod.*29.33,36.

And secondly, It is also further evident by the cleansing of the woman from her unclean issue, for she was not fully cleansed untill she had obtained Gods Attonement by her Sin-Sacrifice, *Levit.*15.30. but as soon as that was performed, then she had Gods Attonement, and then she is said, in ver.31. to be sanctified or separated, for her appearing before God in his Tabernacle, and then she might come as a justified person, without danger of Gods anger, before his presence in his holy Sanctuary.

And thirdly, The Hebrew Doctors do usually say (as I find them cited in *Ainsworth*) that such persons as were ceremonially cleansed by washing, or by the sprinkling of their sin-water, were sanctified; that is to say, they were legally justified, as fit persons for Gods presence in his holy Sanctuary.

Fourthly, The blood of Bulls and Goats did sanctifie, to the purifying of the flesh, no otherwise, but as they procured Gods attonement; for blood materially considered doth not cleanse but defile the flesh, but as it was ordained by the first Covenant, to procure Gods attonement, so it doth formally cleanse and justifie.

Fifthly,

Fifthly, It is further evident, that these legal cleansings did justifie them, by procuring Gods attonement for their ceremonial sins, because Gods eternal attonement and forgiveness, in relation to their legal justifications, is called washing, in *Jer.* 33. 8. and it is called sprinkling and cleansing, in *Ezek.* 36. 25, 29.

And Sixthly, Such as are truly converted to Christ, in the New Testament (and by that means have their sins forgiven them) are said to be Washed, Sanctified, and Justified, 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. And it is worth the marking, that these three figurative expressions are Synonimous, and do all note the true nature of our justification. 1 Cor. 6. 11.

And from these cleansings according to the first Covenant, the Apostle in *Hebr.* 9. 14. doth inforce his Argument thus, *How much more shall the blood of Christ purge* (or sanctifie) *your consciences from dead works*? that is to say, from moral sins, for moral sins did as much defile the conscience, as the touch of a dead person did defile the flesh ceremonially: And saith he, though the blood of Buls and Goats, and the ashes of an Heifer, had power by Gods positive Covenant to cleanse to the sanctifying of the flesh, yet they had not power to cleanse or justifie the conscience from moral sins, *Heb.* 9. 9. *and* 10. 4. But that power was given to the blood of Christ alone, and therefore he said, *Lo I come to do thy will, O God*; by which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all, *Heb.* 10 10, 14. In these words mark the conditions of the eternal Covenant for mans justification, as it is expressed by the Apostle, namely, that it was the will of God to be attoned to sinners for the sake of Christs sacrifice, and that attonement onely doth cleanse the conscience from all moral sins, or it justifies the conscience. Heb. 10. 10.

And secondly, much after this manner doth the Apostle reason touching our justification, in *Rom.* 8. 3, 4. *What the Law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh* (for the corruption and infirmity of the flesh was such, that it could not keep it self pure neither from moral sins, nor from ceremonial sins, as it is disputed in *Col.* 2. 14. and in *Heb.* 7 11, 16, 18, 19.) neither could the ceremonial justifications justifie the conscience from moral sins, *Heb.* 9. 9. *Heb.* 10. 4. *But God sending his Son in the* Rom. 8. 3, 4.

likeness of sinful flesh, (because he sent him to be our Combater with Satan, and gave Satan power to use this seed of the woman as a sinful malefactor, in *Gen.* 3. 15. in this sense he was in the likeness of sinful flesh, because he suffered all kind of injuries from Satan, as a sinner,) *and for sin condemned sin in the flesh*; in these words is set down the ultimate end why God sent Christ in the similitude of sinful flesh, to suffer as a Combater with Satan, and that was to break Satans head-plot, by continuing obedient to the death, and in that obedience to be for sin; that is to say, to make himself a sacrifice for sin; By which means he did first condemn sin, that is to say, the use of all the legal Sin-offerings (because they could not justifie the conscience from moral sins) because his was the perfection of them all, and therefore it was perfectly able to procure his Fathers attonement and absolution, to cleanse the conscience from all the dead works of moral sins.

Thus far of the Exposition of ver. 3. and then it follows in
Rom. 8, 4. ver. 4. *That the Righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us*; or, that the Justification of the Law may be fulfilled in us, as *Tremelius*, and the Syriack, and the vulgar Latin, do translate the Greek word *Dicaioma*, that is here used.

But here it may be demanded, what kind of Righteousness or Justification of the Law doth *Dicaioma* mean, should be fulfilled in us?

The Answer is, Not the righteousness of the moral Law, as Mr. *Norton* doth mis-interpret this Text in p. 233. but the righteousness that was typified by the positive Ordinances of the ceremonial Law, for the Greek word here used is (not *Dicaiosune*, which is the largest word for all kind of righteousness, but) *Dicaioma* which is more restrained to the positive Ordinances, and which in proper English doth signifie the just Ordinance or the righteous estate of the Law, namely, either of the Ceremonial or Judicial Laws, but especially of the Ceremonial Laws, as Mr. *Ainsworth* sheweth, in *Numb.* 31. 21. in *Gen.* 26. 5. in *Deut.* 4. 1, 14. and in *Psal.* 2. 7.

2 This is the true interpretation of *Dicaioma*, as it is further evident, because the Apostle doth use this word to describe the nature of their legal justifications of divine Service, in *Heb.* 9. 1. 10. which he calls carnal justifications, in vers. 10, as

Mr.

Mr. *Dickson* and others have well observed.

3 This word is also used by the Septuagint, for the righteous making of things, as well as of persons, that were ceremonially unclean (for no dead things, or unreasonable creatures are guilty of moral sins) but by Gods positive Ordinance, they may bee guilty of Ceremonial sins, *Numb.* 31.19,20,21, 22,23,24.

4 Hence it follows, That this kind of positive ceremonial righteousness was typical to such as had faith in the observation of these Statutes, to look from the typical ordinances of cleansing and righteous making, to the positive sacrifice of Christ, as the perfection of all the typical cleansings, for that only was ordained to procure Gods eternal Reconciliation in not imputing sin, for the cleansing of the conscience from moral sins; therefore such as did thus keep the Statutes and Ordinances of Righteousness, as *Zachary* and *Elizabeth* did, *Luke* 1.6. should obtain thereby an everlasting Righteousness in Gods sight, instead of the Ceremonial.

And this Doctrine is clearly taught and expressed in *Deut.* 6. 24,25. I say from these verses it is plain, that their outward and legal observations of their positive Statutes, did make them righteous, or justifie their bodies, as fit persons for Gods holy presence in his holy Sanctuary, and for feasting with him (as their attoned God in Covenant) on the flesh of their Passovers, and Peace-offerings, and so it typifies true justification, and therefore their careful doing of these typical Ordinances had an outward blessing promised, as to persons that were outwardly justified, as well as they which had faith in Christ, had the promise of Gods Reconciliation for their eternal justification. Deut. 6. 24,25.

5 This word *Dicaioma* is used by the Septuagint to express their outward righteousness, or justification by their exact care in observing the positive judicial Laws of *Moses*. And for this also see *Ainsworth* in *Exod.* 21.1. *Num.* 15.15.

But as I said before, it is chiefly applyed to the positive Statutes that concerned Gods worship in his Sanctuary, and so to the judicial positive Statutes as they did chiefly respect their judicial trials about their Ceremonial righteousness, and their justification thereby in his Sanctuary, as these places do evidence;

dence; in all which the Septuagint use the word *Dicaioma* for that kind of righteousness chiefly, as in *Gen.* 26. 5. *Exod.* 15. 25, 26. *Lev.* 25, 18. *Numb.* 27. 11. *Numb.* 30. 16. *Numb.* 31. 21. *Deut.* 4. 1, 5, 8, 14, 40, 45. *Deut.* 5 1, 37. *Deut.* 6. 1, 2, 17, 20, 24, 25. 2 *King.* 17. 13, 34, 37. *Psal.* 18. 22. *Psal.* 50. 16. *Psal.* 98. 31. *Psal.* 105. 45. *Psal.* 119. 5, 8, 12, 16, 23, 33, 48, 54, 71, 80, 112, 117, 135, 145, 155, 171. *Psal.* 47. 19. and *Ezek.* 26. 37.

6 This word *Dicaioma*, is by our Translators rendred Justification, in *Rom.* 5. 16. and that most fitly, because it doth in that place set out the true nature of our eternal justification in Gods sight (by his gracious forgiveness) as being the truth of their legal and typical justifications, for the Apostle doth reason here about justification, in the same manner as hee did in *Heb.* 9. for there hee reasons thus; *If* (saith hee) *the blood of Buls and Goats, and the ashes of an Heifer, sprinkling the unclean, doth sanctifie to the purifying, or justifying of the flesh* (namely, by procuring Gods Attonement, as I have explained the matter a little before) (then saith hee) *How much more shall the blood of Christ purge your conscience from dead works?* (namely, by obtaining Gods Attonement for your moral sins, as it is the truth of the typical justification.)

Rom. 5. 16. And just after this sort doth the Apostle reason in *Rom.* 5. 16. *The free gift* (namely the free gift of Gods gracious forgiveness) *is of many offences to justification.*

The tongue of Angels cannot express the true nature and form of our eternal justification, plainer than in the words of this 16. verse; but for further light, I will cite *Tindals* Translation, thus, And the gift is not over one sin, as death came through one sin, of one that sinned; For damnation came of one sin to condemnation, but the gift came to justifie from many sins.

7 This word *Dicaioma* is by our Translators rendred *Righteousness*, in *Rom.* 5. 18. *By the Righteousness of one*; namely, by the righteousness of Christ in obeying Gods positive Law and Covenant, by making his soul a Sin-offering (as soon as hee had finished his combate with Sathan) according to his Covenant with his Father; *The free gift* (namely, the free gift of Gods gracious forgiveness) *of many offences* (as it is expressed in vers. 16.) *came upon all men* (to righteousness, or) *to the justification*

of

of life; So called, to distinguish it from the legal justification: for our spiritual death in sin entred upon all men by *Adams* transgression of Gods positive Law, verse 12. and here life from that death is procured by the obedence of Christ to Gods positive Law in making his soul a Sin-sacrifice.

8 This is also worth our observation, that this word *Dicaioma*, is used by the Apostle, to express both the meritorious cause of our justification, in verse 18. by the righteousnes of Christ in his death, and the formal cause of our justification, in verse 16. by Gods Attonement or forgivenes, procured thereby, just according to the types in the Law: For first, there was the meritorious cause of their legal justification, by washing, by sprinkling, and by the blood of Buls and Goats, and then followed the formal cause of their legal justification, by Gods attonement procured thereby.

And this is worthy of all due observation, That the platform of our moral justification in the meritorious and formal causes, was exemplified by Gods positive Statutes and Ordinances, and therefore the Holy Ghost doth most fitly express it by this peculiar term *Dicaioma*. And

9 *Daniel* doth in this order compare the true justification, with the ceremonial, in Chap. 9. 24. Seventy weeks (saith hee) are determined for the death of the Messiah, to finish Trespas (offerings) and to end Sin (offerings) and to make Reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in (or procure) an Everlasting Righteousnes, instead of the ceremonial; here you see that the death of Christ is put for the end and perfection of all Trespas and Sin-offerings to make an eternal Reconciliation for iniquity, instead of the legal, and so to bring in, or procure an eternal Righteousnes by Gods eternal Reconciliation instead of the legal, and in this very order of causes doth *Paul* argue, in 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. Dan. 9. 24.

10 This word *Dicaiomata* is by our Translators rendred the righteousnes of the Law, in *Rom.* 2. 26. namely, the Righteousnes of the ceremonial Law; If (saith he) the uncircumcised keep (the *Dicaiomata*) the righteousnesses of the Law (in the plural number) namely, if the uncircumcision do instead of the outward observation of the Righteousnesses of the ceremonial Law (by the blood of Bulls, and Goats, and Rom. 2. 26.

the ashes of an Heifer sprinkling the unclean, which procured Gods attonement for their legal sins) do by faith look to the end of these things, namely, to the death of Christ, as the true procuring cause of Gods eternal Attonement, and Absolution, for the purging of their conscience from the condemning power of their moral sins; shall not their uncircumcision (in this case) bee counted or imputed to them for true circumcision, and so consequently for true justification? for he that doth thus keep the Law, shall live thereby, as I have expounded *Lev.* 18. 5. But the heathen spiritual Christians do thus keep the law by faith; for it is Prophesied of them, *That in the dayes of the Messiah, they shall offer sacrifices of a greater quantity, than those that were offered by the Jews under the Law of Moses, Ezek.* 46. 5, 11. and this they must do by faith, by looking from the carnal types to the spiritual things that are typified thereby: And in this respect, it is the prayer of all the godly in all Nations, that they may be sound in Gods Statutes, *Psal.* 119. 80, 112. which cannot bee till they have faith to look to the end of those things, which is typified by the righteousness of those Ordinances and Statutes.

11. Dr. *Hammond* doth also fully concur with Mr. *Ainsworths* exposition in *Rom.* 8. 4. as I have formerly noted it in Chap. 8. though it is fit also to bee here again remembred.

12. As the word *Righteousness*, so the word *Law* in *Rom.* 8. 4. and the word *Law* in *Rom.* 10. 4. (which I have expounded chiefly of the Law of Rites) is made good and strengthened by these considerations, and by these learned Expositors; namely, *That Christ is the end of the Law for Righteousness.* Rom. 10 4.

1. I beleeve that I have already sufficiently put the matter out of controversie, that the Jews legal justifications by their washings and sacrifices, did relate to his Death and Sacrifice as the end of them all, as I shewed from *Dan.* 9. 24. and it is further evident by *Tit.* 2. 14. there redeeming us from iniquity, and purifying by Gods Attonement, is put together as cause and effect; and thus Christ is the end of the Law for Righteousness. And I find that the word *Law* in the New Testament, as well as the Old, is to be understood chiefly of the Ceremonial Laws; it is used thirteen times in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and

and in all those places, except once, it must bee understood of the Ceremonial Laws; and so it is often used in the Epistle to the *Galathians*, and most for the Law of Rites, or for the whole Oeconomy of *Moses*, having respect wholly to the Law of Rites.

13 It is also worthy of all due observation, that none of their legal justifications did justifie them by any actual kind of purity put upon their flesh, that so it might bee imputed to them for their justification, but their righteousnes was conveyed to them by Gods positive Ordinance, even by a passive purity only, by washing and purging away their Ceremonial sins, and so by the blood of Buls procuring Gods attonement thereby for their Ceremonial sins, for blood doth not cleanse otherwise but by procuring Gods attonement and forgivenes; Blood materially considered doth not wash, but defile the flesh, but formally considered, as it was ordained by Gods positive Law, to be a sacrifice for the procuring of Gods Reconcillation, so only it hath a cleansing quality, and accordingly it pleased God by his voluntary positive Law and Covenant, to ordain that the blood of Christ should much more cleanse out conscience from dead works, because it was ordained to be the meritorious procuring cause of Gods Attonement and Absolution; for it is Gods Attonement (as I have often said, to have it the better marked) that doth formally cleanse, purge, and purifie our conscience from dead works.

And this is that righteousnes of sinners that is so much spoken of, and typified in the Law; and therefore this kind of language touching a sinners righteousnes, though it may seem strange to some, yet it needs not seem strange to any, that are but meanly acquainted with the language of the Ceremonial Types, which is our School-master to Christ.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 225.

Most vain is the shift of the Dialogue, endeavouring to avoid the strength of this place (of Rom. 10. 4.) *by interpreting against Text, Context and Scripture, these words, The Righteousnes of the Law, only of the Righteousnes typified by the Ceremonial Law.*

Reply 4. Most vain is the shift of Mr. *Norton*, endeavoring to avoid the strength of this place, by interpreting the word *Law, and the righteousnes thereof*, of the righteousnes of the moral Law, both against the Text, Context, and Scripture, as it is evident by what I have already said, and as it is further evident by the context; For the third verse hath a close dependance on *Rom.* 9.31,32. Where the Apostle doth blame the Jews for trusting to their outward ceremonial works chiefly, though they trusted also to their outward observation of the whole Oeconomy of *Moses*; *Israel which followed after the Law of righteousnes, hath not attained to the Law of righteousnes* (namely, they have not attained to the true righteousnes, that was typified by their legal righteousnes) because with the works of the Law they did not couple Faith to the Sacrifice of Christ, as being the end of the Law.

Tindal on the word *Righteousnes*, in *Rom.* 10.3. saith thus, in pag. 381.

The Jews seek righteousnes in their Ceremonies, which God gave unto them, not for to justifie them, but to describe and paint Christ unto them; Mark, That he makes the word Law, and the righteousnes thereof, to relate to their Ceremonies.

Ibidem, They go about to establish their own righteousnes, and are not obedient to the righteousnes that commeth of God, which is the forgivenes of sin in Christs blood, to all that repent and believe; This is the coherence between the third verse, and *Rom.* 9.31. And from this coherence it follows in this fourth verse, *That Christ is the end of the Law for righteousnes.*

Rom. 9.31. In his Com. pl par. 2. p. 580.

Secondly, *P. Martyr* on *Rom.* 9.31. saith, of the former interpretation thus,

Indeed, I dislike it not; and in his Common places he doth expound the word Law, and the righteousnes thereof, not as Mr. *Norton* doth of the moral Law, but of the whole Oeconomy of *Moses*, having respect chiefly to the ceremonial Law, and Mr. *Wotton* treads in his steps, and *Vindiciæ fidei* cites several other Orthodox to that Opinion, *par.* 2. *p.* 160.

And see *Wotton de reconc. peccat. par.* 1. *l.* 2. *c.* 19.

Gratius in his war and peace, p. 24. Rom. 3.27.

Thirdly, *Gratius* expounds the Law of works, in *Rom.* 3.27. of the Law of the carnal commandement, quite contrary to Mr. *Nortons* exposition, for Mr. *Norton* doth expound this word Law, in p. 177. and 189. of the Law of Nature given to *Adam* in

in his innocency; but according to *Grotius*, and according to truth, it must be expounded of the Law of Works given to the Jews, for their legal justification from their ceremonial sins, when they appeared in Gods holy presence in his Sanctuary; for it is most evident, that God made a Covenant of Works with the Jews, for their outward Justification, when they came into his holy Sanctuary, as well as a Covenant of Grace in Christ for their moral justification in his presence, both here and at the day of judgement.

But in time, namely, when the Prophets ceased, the carnal Jews abused this Covenant of Works, as they did the brazen Serpent, by trusting to it, as well for their moral as for their ceremonial justification in the sight of God; And against this sort of justification by works doth the Apostle *Paul* dispute in his Epistle to the *Romans*, and to the *Galatians*, &c.

Behold (say the Hebrew Doctors) it is said in the Law, *ye shall keep my Statutes, and all my Judgements, and do them.* Our wise men have said, *That keeping and doing must be applied to the Statutes (as well) as unto the Judgements*, &c. Now the Judgements they are Commandements; the reason (or meaning) whereof is manifest, and the good that commeth by doing of them is known in this world, as the forbidding to rob, and to shed blood, and the commandement to honor Father and Mother. But the Statutes (or Ordinances) are commandements, the reason whereof is not known, &c. And all the sacrifices every one generally are Statutes (or Ordinances) and our wise men have said, that for the services of the Sacrifices the world doth continue, for by doing the Statutes and the Judgements, righteous men are made worthy of life in the world to come, and the Law setteth the commandement of the statute first, saying, *and yee shall keep my Statutes and my Judgements, which if a man do he shall live in them.* *Levit.* 18. 5. By this, and such like testimonies which might be cited from the Hebrew Doctors, we may see as in a glass how the carnal Jews understood the word Law; namely, of all the Oeconomy of *Moses*, but chiefly and principally of the ceremonial Statutes and Ordinances; and in that respect they put their trust in their outward observation of the said Ordinances, which were indeed given them for their outward justification; and by this kind of righteousness *Paul* was made alive until

See Ainf. in Lev. 5. 15.

God opened his eyes to see his sinful condition, by the spiritual application of the Law to his conscience, *Phil.* 3. 9. and then from the typical, he saw his inward justification.

And secondly, This is worth marking, as I mentioned before, that in their legal justification, no actual holiness was put upon them, but onely their ceremonial sins of uncleanness were purged from them, and that was their justice or justification, when they stood before him in his Sanctuary, for it is said, *That the blood of Buls and Goats, and the ashes of an Heifer sprinkling the unclean, did sanctifie to the purifying of the flesh*; but that kind of sanctification was obtained by their ceremonial purifyings, which did procure Gods attonement in forgiving sin, and no other Sanctification was ordained for their legal Justification.

Natural Philosophers, saith *Peter Martyr*, cannot be perswaded that the absolution of God procured by sacrifice did make men righteous, and therefore they did not call it our righteousness; but you may see that *Peter Martyr* held (according to the ceremonial types) that the pacifying of God, and the procuring of his attonement by the sacrifice of Christ, is a sinners righteousness.

P. *Martyr* spake these words in his last explanation of Justification, and therefore though his former expressions do somewhat differ, it is not so much to be stood on, as on what he saith here in his last meditations.

I say, this way of justification God was pleased to ordaine by his voluntary positive Law and Covenant with Christ, which was also typified by his positive Covenant of Works, with the Jews.

1 It was his voluntary Covenant with Christ, that upon his undertaking to make his soul a sacrifice for sin, he would be reconciled to beleeving sinners, by not imputing their sins, to them; that is to say, he would justifie them from their sins by his gracious forgiveness; and therefore it is Gods Righteousness according to his Covenant with Christ, not to impute their sins, but to justifie them formally by his non-imputation. I say it again, to have it the better marked, That this kind of righteousness God hath constituted to be a sinners righteousness, from his voluntary Covenant with Christ, where the rule in all natural causes, *posità causâ sequitur effectus*, is not to be observed; for all voluntary Causes have voluntary Effects, according to the liberty of will that is in the Covenanters; they by their positive Ordinance and Covenant have constituted a righteousness

teousnes for sinners by the meritorious cause of Christs Sacrifice, and by the formal cause of Gods reconciliation, as soon as the Holy Ghost hath united them to Christ by Faith.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in p. 211. &c.

Pardon of sin cannot compleat Righteousness, for Righteousness doth not consist in being sinless, but also in being just; the Heavens are sinless, yet they are not just; the unreasonable creature is sinless (saith he) in p. 209. *but not righteous.*

Reply 5. Every mean person known, that the Heavens, and such like unreasonable Creatures, are a subject that is not capable of forgiveness, because they are not capable of sin in a proper sense, and therefore also they are not capable of this kind of righteousness: But the Dialogue speaks only of sinners that are reasonable creatures; yea, and of such sinners as are in Christ; and therefore it speaks of such creatures as are capable of pardon, and so they are fit subjects of being made righteous by pardon.

But Secondly, Why cannot pardon compleat righteousness? hath not God a supreme power by his voluntary Law and Covenant, to make it a sinners formal righteousness, as well as he had to constitute a fruit tree (which he called the Tree of Life) to confirm *Adam* in his created perfections, if he had but once eaten thereof? We must not look to what is a perfect righteousness to our senses; but we must look to Gods positive Ordinance; he could tell how to ordain such a righteousness as will best fit sinners.

Thirdly, We see also, that by his own voluntary Ordinance, he made unreasonable creatures that are not guilty of moral sins, to be guilty of ceremonial sins, and to be capable also of ceremonial justification, as I instanced afore of the Temple, it was first polluted by *Antiochus*, and it was afterwards justified by sanctified Priests, in carrying out the filth thereof, *Dan.* 8. 14. The like may be said of the defiled leprous house, and of the cleansing of it, in *Levit.* 14. And see more for this in *Ainsw.* in *Exod.* 29, 36.

But

But saith Mr. *Norton* in p. 212.

The material cause of Justification.

If you inquire after the essential matter of justification, among the causes enumerated by the Author; behold the Dialogue is speechless, and presents you with a form without matter, such a being as is neither created nor increated. And he takes delight in this Irony, because he doth so often repeat it, as in p. 212, 217, 225, 237, &c.

Reply 6. Herein Mr. *Norton* doth mock at Gods Wisdom and Work, in giving a form to the Angels without matter. Mr. *Ainsworth* saith, that the Angels have a form without matter, and he cites *Maymony* to concur in that, in *Gen.* 1. 1. Yea, the matter of mans body, and the form of Angels, may be united to do service to man, and yet not be but one person, but may continue still to be both distinct matter without form, and form without matter; As for example, when the Angels assumed bodies, it was not to give that matter any natural form, but it was a miraculous union, onely for their present ministry to men: And hence you see that the matter of mans body and the form of Angels may be united, and yet remain two distinct things.

Secondly, Mr. *Norton* doth not only mock at the Dialogue, but at sundry other eminent Divines, who make no other material cause than the Dialogue doth.

1. The Dialogue saith, that the subject matter of Justification is beleeving sinners; and in this the Dialogue follows learned Mr. *Wotton*.

See *P. Martyr* in Rom. 3. 26.

And 2. Mr. *Wotton* doth follow *Peter Martyr*, who makes no other material cause in Justification, but beleeving sinners.

And *Ball* on the Coven. p. 219.

And 3. Saith M. *Ball*, It is to be observed, that the Apostle saith, *God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself*; where (saith he) the world is the subject or matter of reconciliation, and by the same reason he makes it the matter of Justification, for he makes Justification to be a branch, at least of Reconciliation, if not the whole, as I noted before.

4. Mr.

4. Mr. *John Goodwin* doth learnedly dispute against that kind of material cause, that Mr. *Norton* contends for, and hee also follows Mr. *Wotton* for the subject matter. See *Vindicia fidei*, par. 2.

5. Mr. *Baxter*, in his Aphorisms, p. 213. enumerating the causes, saith, that a material cause properly it hath none; If, saith he, you will improperly call Christs satisfaction the remote matter, I contend not. And in p. 217. he saith thus, Christs righteousness cannot be the material cause of an act, which hath no matter.

And in his Reply to Mr. *Ayre*, p. 20. Sect. 4. He saith thus.

First, As matter is proper to substance, so Justification being an accident hath no matter; are not you of the same mind?

Secondly, As accidents do inhere in the subject, so the subject is commonly called their matter; In this sense also our righteousness or justification passive is not in Christs righteousness, but in our selves, and so our selves are the matter; for I think it is we that are justified: and (saith he) in another place, if any please to make the blood of Christ the matter improperly, I contend not. And to this I do also give my consent. But Mr. *Norton* makes Christs suffering of hell torments, and the second death, to be the matter, and this matter I cannot consent to.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in p. 222.

To speak after the stile of the Dialogue; if righteousness for sinners be purchased and procured by Christs sacrifice of atonement; neither then can atonement be a sinners righteousness: that which procureth or purchaseth is the cause, that which is procured is the effect; the cause cannot be the effect.

Reply 7. 1 The stile of the Dialogue is borrowed very much from the types of the ceremonial Law, which were ordained to be our School-master to Christ; and I believe, if more pains were taken to express the point of satisfaction, and the point of justification, in that stile, it would be much for the clearing of the truth.

2 It seems that Mr. *Norton* will have no other righteousness

for a sinners formal righteousness, but Christs moral righteousness imputed; for he makes the Fathers righteousness in being attoned to sinners, of no account in the formal cause; But, saith Mr. *Baxter* in his Apology to Mr. *Blake*, p. 24. It must be known, that the righteousness given us, is not the righteousness whereby Christs person was righteous (for accidents perish being removed from their subject) but it is a righteousness merited, by Christs satisfaction and obedience, for us: And that can be no other, say I, but a passive righteousness by Gods merciful atonement in not imputing sin, as I have exemplified it from the types of Gods positive Statutes and Ordinances.

3. I have already shewed, and I think it needful to repeat it again: First, That it was Christs satisfactory Righteousness to perform the Covenant on his part by his death and sacrifice. And secondly, That it was Gods Righteousness to perform the Covenant on his part, which was, to be reconciled to sinners, by not imputing their sins to them, as soon as they are in Christ by faith; The meritorious righteousness of the death and sufferings of Christs combate with Satan, performed on his part, did bind God to perform his said Reconciliation on his part; and both these Righteousnesses, together with the performance of the Covenant on the part of the Holy Ghost, which was to proceed from the Father and the Son, to convert sinners, and to unite them to Christ, that so they might be fit subjects for the said righteousness; I say, this voluntary, and reciprocial Covenant between the Trinity, doth constitute all the causes of a sinners righteousness; and in particular, the Covenant on the Fathers part doth constitute the formal part of it. This positive created Righteousness was unknown to natural Philosophers, it is not framed from the moral Law of Nature, but it is a Righteousness for sinners, created on purpose by the voluntary positive Law and Covenant of the Trinity.

4. I cannot but wonder that Mr. *Norton* should so much plead for the moral righteousness of Christ to be the matter, and the imputation of it to be the form of our righteousness; seeing it did not formally constitute *Adams* righteousness, as Mr. *Norton* himself doth also acknowledge, in p. 261. and Mr. *Burges* on Justi-

Justification, p.8. and indeed the reason thereof is very plain, because God required that *Adam* should first eate of the tree of life, as the meritorious cause for procuring the formality of his moral perfections, and this tree had this efficacy from Gods voluntary positive Covenant with *Adam*. As I have shewed more large already, chap. 2.

The Dialogue saith, that sinners in themselves, namely, as long as they continue to be sinners, which is as long as they live in this body of sin, can have no other righteousnes than a passive righteousnes, proceeding from Gods merciful attonement, pardon, and forgivenes.

But Mr. *Norton* in p. 231. leaves out these words [*in themselves*] and then makes a false Argument of the Dialogues sense.

But I dare say, no judicious Christian, that will but make through search into all the types of legal Justification, shall find any other way of making sinners righteous, but by Attonement, or Reconciliation in not imputing sin. Reckon up the legal terms, by which Attonement is expressed, and that will justifie what I say; as by expiating sin, not imputing sin, mercifully forgiving sin, purging sin, purifying, washing, cleansing sin, to the sanctifying the flesh; these, and such like are abundantly used in the Law; but never any for making righteous by imputing moral righteousnes, which doubtless would have been ordained to typifie the imputation of Christs moral righteousnes in the formal cause of Justification, if any such thing had been intended for the only formal cause.

5. It seems to me, that Mr. *Norton* doth wilfully stumble at the stile of the Dialogue, because it makes a sinners righteousnes to be procured by Christs sacrifice of Attonement; but any one may see that this phrase, the Sacrifice of Attonement, (at which he stumbles) is a usual Scripture phrase, for the publick yearly Sin-Offering is called the Sin of Attonements, *Exod.* 30. 10. and the Ram of Attonement, *Numb.* 5. 8. And all Sacrifices were ordained by Gods voluntary Covenant, to procure Gods Attonement, and Justification from all their legal sins; even peace-Offerings were sometimes offered to procure

Reconciliation or Attonement described both in the meritorious & formal causes.

peace by Gods attonement, and in relation to their typical use, the sacrifice of Christ may well be called a Sacrifice of Attonement for the procuring of Gods attonement for all our moral sins, and so consequently for our moral justification; and this is most cleer, because the Apostle doth define Gods reconciliation to sinners, by his not imputing their sins to them, 2 *Cor.* 5. 19. for as long as sin is imputed it makes a jar between God and the sinner; but when God doth not impute sin, then there is no more jar, but reconciliation with God: And therefore the sin of Attonement, which was offered on Reconciliation-day, is called by the Septuagint, the Purgation of sins, because it procured Gods Attonement, by which only sin is purged away, *Exod.* 30. 10. and this place the Apostle applies to the sacrifice of Christ, *Heb.* 1. 3. namely, as it is the meritorious cause of Gods reconcilliation, whereby our sins are fully purged.

Gen. 32. 20.

The Hebrew word for Reconciliation doth signifie to cover, pacifie, or appease, noting thereby the meritorious cause, *Gen.* 32. 20. *Prov.* 16. 14. and to bee pacified, doth note the formal cause; It doth also signifie to satisfie, or recompence, noting thereby the meritorious cause, 2 *Sam.* 21. 3. *Exod.* 21. 30. *Psal.* 49. 8. *Gen.* 31. 29. and to bee satisfied, doth note the formal cause of Reconciliation, as in *Mat.* 3. 17. *This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased, satisfied or reconciled*; and so in *Psal.* 85. 1, 2. *Lord, thou hast been favourable, or well-pleased with thy land, Thou hast forgiven the iniquities of thy people, and covered all their sin*; These three several phrases are *Synonimas*, and do set out the formal cause of Reconciliation or Justification; but whether the Psalmist is to be understood of outward or inward Reconciliation, needs not now to be disputed, because the outward is but an exemplification of the inward.

And hence it follows, that Christs sacrifice may well bee called a Sacrifice of Attonement, because it was exemplified by the legal sacrifices of Attonement, and because it was ordained to procure Gods Attonement; and in this respect also all Sacrifices of Attonement, are called Sacrifices of Righteousnes, *Deut.* 33. 19. *Psal.* 4. 5. *Psal.* 51. 19. not only because they were offered in faith, as Mr. *Norton* doth too unadvisedly restrain the sense of the word Righteousnes, in p. 208. but they are also called

Deut. 33. 19. Psal. 51. 19.

led Sacrifices of Righteousnes, because they did legally compleat a sinners righteousnes, in respect of his ceremonial sins, and so also they did exemplifie how a sinners righteousnes should be compleated by the meritorious and formal causes in respect of his moral sins; sacrifices must be performed in righteousnes, that is to say, without spot or wrinkle, for then they were offered in righteousnes, according to Gods Law, and then God accepted them, and granted his Attonement according to his Covenant, and that was his righteousnes, and then when he was attoned to sinners, it was their righteousnes; this is suitable to legal righteousnes, by which God did exemplifie our moral righteousnes.

Conclusion.

Gods Attonement or Reconciliation, hath these two parts:

1 His not imputing sin.

2 His receiving into favour, or both these may bee joyned into one, namely, Gods gracious pardon; and all this is the effect of Christs sacrifice, for it is for his sacrifice sake that God the Father doth absolve or acquit a beleeving sinner that is in Christ, from the guilt of all his sins, and so receives him into favour by adoption; or thus, Gods Attonement for the sake of Christs Sacrifice, is not a bare legal forgivenes, as when a Judge acquits a Malefactor, and so leaves him; but it is a gracious acquital, as when a Father forgives his Son, and receives him into favour.

And this truth the Dialogue doth fully expres; and therefore Mr. *Norton* doth argue sophistically and absurdly against the rules of Logick, and his own conscience; for hee knows that in his antecedent, this phrase [*By Christs Sacrifice of Attonement*] is meant both of the cause and effect; Christs sacrifice being the cause, and Gods attonement the effect; and therefore seeing the sacrifice of Christ is all along so plainly intended by the Dialogue, to be the only meriting cause of the formal, namely, of Gods attonement, for a sinners righteousnes or justification, It follows, that the consequence which Mr. *Norton* draws from it, *viz.* neither then can attonement bee a sinners righteousnes, is a senseles *non sequitur*.

And now I leave it to the judicious Reader to judge whe-

ther Mr. *Norton* had any just cause to thunder out such reproachful censures against this kind of attonement in the Dialogue, as he hath done in page 210, 223, 224, 237. and saith hee in page 228. the attonement of the Dialogue is not Gods attonement, but a pestilent fiction and abomination. My heart trembles at this high blasphemy, the Lord in mercy open his eyes to see better.

And saith Mr. *Norton* in page 210.

The Reader is desired to take full notice of the Dialogues corrupt sense, being the Helena, *&c.*

Reply 8. The Reader is also desired to examine throughly, who hath the truth on his side, and also to take full notice whether he can find such an active moral righteousnes imputed, as Mr. *Norton* doth substitute in page 210. for the formal cause of a sinners righteousnes; I have made search into the method of righteous-making by the typical sacrifices, and cannot find any such righteous-making, as Mr. *Norton* holds; examine therefore whether I have not both in the Dialogue, and in this Chapter, rightly opened the types thereof, both in the meritorious and formal causes.

But saith Mr. *Norton* page 209.

The Hebrew translated Attonement, properly signifieth to cover some thing, yet not with a garment, or the like, which may bee taken off again; but with some cleaving and tenacious matter, as Pitch, Lime, Morter, &c.

Reply 9. This exposition of the word Attonement, may (I conceive) mis-lead the Reader as well as himself, because hee restrains it to Pitch, or such like tenacious matter that cannot be taken off again, and therefore I will open the use of the word for the advantage of the Readers.

I find by *Kirkerus* Hebrew-Greek-Lexicon) That the Hebrew *Caphar* doth signifie to cover: This is the general sense of the word; But what kind of covering is to bee understood by the

the word, must bee fetched from the circumstances of each particular text where it is used; As for example, in *Gen.* 6. 14. it is used for such a covering as is made with Bitumen, Pitch, Tar, Rosin, and such like cleaving things, because that kind of covering was onely fit to stop and cover the chinks and cracks that were in the Ark, to preserve it from perishing in the waters (a figure of Gods Attonement in our Baptism, that covereth our sins, and so saveth us) but saith *Ainsworth* in *Gen.* 6. 14. there are two other Hebrew words in *Exod.* 2. 3. which are the proper words for Pitch and Plaister, and therefore *Cophar* is used for Pitch in *Gen.* 6. 14. but in a metaphorical sense, and in that respect *Tindal* in 1 *Job.* 2. 2. doth apply it (and that most fitly) to mollifying Plaisters, that are laid on angry sores to mollifie and asswage their angry pain.

2 This Hebrew word is also used for the Hoar-frost, in *Exo.* 16. 14. because the Manna did lye upon, or cover the ground (after the dew was exhaled) just like as the Hoar-frost doth cover the ground. It is also put for the Hoar-frost in *Job* 38. 29. and in *Psal.* 147. 16. but there the Septuagint do translate it Clouds; and indeed it is not unfit, because Clouds do cover the face of the Skie, and do also scatter the Hoar-frost, Hail, and Snow, which do often cover the face of the earth; but these kind of coverings are soon taken off again, therefore it doth not alwayes signifie such a covering as may not be taken off again, and it is applied to Cypress trees, because it is a pleasant shady cover against the scorching Sun, *Cant.* 1. 13.

3 *Cophar* is applied to the covering of an angry countenance by some acceptable present; And thus *Jacob* did cover *Esau's* angry face, *I will,* said *Jacob, cover* (or appease) *his face with the present that goeth before me, and afterward I will see his face,* Gen. 32. 20. And in this sense, a wise man will cover the Kings angry face, *Prov.* 16. 14.

4 *Cophar* is put for a Bribe, because a Bribe doth cover the eyes of the Judge, and causeth him to pervert Justice, *Amos* 5. 12. but said just *Samuel* to the people, *Of whose hand have I received any present* (namely, by way of a Bribe) *to cover mine eyes therewith is in the case of Justice?* 1 *Sam.* 12. 3. Exod. 30. 12. A further description of Gods Attonement in respect both of the meritorious & formal causes

5 *Cophar* is put for a price of Redemption, because it doth cover the offended face of the Supreme, and reconcile him,

Es.

* *Esa.* 43. 3. But jealousie saith *Prov.* 6. 35. is outragious, it will not regard the presence of any cover or ransom. See also in *Numb.* 35. 31. and *Psal.* 41. 8. and in *Exod.* 21. 30. and in *Exod.* 30. 12. They shall give every man the ransom of his soul, or the cover of his soul, namely, half a shekel for every man to cover Gods angry face, that there be no plague among them to take away their lives, as he had done from the former Six hundred thousand.

That onely is the full and formal price of our redemption, that was constituted so to be by Gods voluntary positive Law and Covenant.

But mark, this price which God appointed them to give for the ransom, or cover of their souls from death, which else would certainly have fallen upon them, was but half a Shekel, which in humane reason (materially considered) cannot be esteemed a sufficient price for the ransom of their souls from death, as *David* sheweth, in *Psal.* 49. 7, 8. yea, though it were paid yearly during life: But formally considered, namely as it was ordained by Gods positive Law and Covenant to be paid and accepted as the price of redeeming their lives from death, so it was the full price of their lives, because Gods positive Law and Covenant had made it to be a full price; if they had offered many thousands of silver for the redemption of their lives, yet it had not been a sufficient price without Gods positive Law and Covenant: As I have shewed in Chap. 8. in *Ahabs* offer to *Naboth*, in 1 *King.* 21. 3. Even so it was Gods positive Law and Covenant, that made the death and sacrifice of Christ to be the full price to cover Gods angry face, or to attone him for the ransom of the many, *Mat.* 20. 28. 1 *Tim.* 2. 6.

2 King. 21. 3.

1 Tim. 2. 6.

See *Ainsw.* in Exod. 30. 12. and Lev. 28. 4.

The said price of redemption is called the silver of Attonements, *Exod.* 30. 16. and with this mony, or at least with part of it, they bought the daily sacrifices, that were offered morning and evening for the procuring Gods attonement to the whole Church of *Israel*, and with this money they also purchased the publick Sin-offerings and Trespass-offerings, and therefore it was called sin-mony, and trespass-mony, 2 *King.* 12. 16. *Neh.* 10. 32, 33. but in *Exo.* 30. 16. is called attonement mony, and by some Translations redemption-mony, because redemption is obtained by procuring Gods attonement; and hence we may see the reason why we are said to be *bought with a price*, 1 *Cor.* 6. 20. and why the blood of Christ is called a price, 1 *Pet.* 1. 18, 19. the phrase of *a price* given to the Sacrifice, and so to Christs sacrifice,

crifice, is borrowed from the price that God appointed them to pay for the redemption of their lives, and for the buying of sacrifices of attonement, for the procuring of Gods attonement for the redemption of their lives, and so for their justification in his sight.

Sixthly, *Caphar* is used for the covering of Gods angry face from moral sins that defile the Land, by executing impartial Justice upon Malefactors; And thus *Phinees*, when he executed justice on the Fornicators, did by that means (cover Gods angry face, or) make attonement for the Sons of *Israel*, *Numb.* 25.17. In like sort, when Gods angry face had been upon the Land by a three years famine, for *Sauls* bloody sin, in slaying the innocent *Gibbeonites*: *Then* David *said to the* Gibbeonites, *wherewith shall I* (covet Gods angry face, or) *make attonement, that ye may bless the inheritance of the Lord*, 2 Sam. 21.3. Then they said in ver. 6. *Let seven of his Sons be given, and we will hang them up to the Lord*; and so Gods angry face was covered and attoned. Deut. 21. 8.

It is also said in *Numb.* 35.33. Blood polluteth the Land, and there shall be no (covering of my anger, or) attonement made for the Land, but by the blood of him that shed it; and in case of a secret murderer, yet by Gods Ordinance the Land was guilty, till the Elders of the people had made attonement by the death of a Bullock, *Exod.* 21.8.

Seventhly, *Caphar* is used for the covering of Gods angry face from ceremonial sins, by typical Sacrifices of Attonement, and from the moral sins of our souls, by the true sacrifice of Christ.

And this kind of covering by Attonement doth alwaies denote Gods forgiveness and receiving into favor, as *Lev.* 4.20, 26, 31, 35. *Lev.* 5.6, 10, 13, 16, 18. And sometimes it is expressed by making clean, as in *Numb.* 8.21. *Lev.* 16.30.

Mr. *Ainsworth* in *Gen.* 32.20. saith, This word *Caphar* is often used in the Law for covering or taking away offences, and for pacifying anger by gifts, and so making Attonement, as in *Exod.* 29.36. *Levit.* 1.4, 20, 26. *and* 5.6, 10, 13. *Deut.* 21.8. And saith he, in *Psal.* 65.4. Our trespasses thou wilt mercifully cover them, namely, expiate, propitiate, purge away, and so mercifully cover and forgive them.

And, saith he, the Hebrew *Caphar* signifies to cover; and saith he, the cover of the Ark was called *Capporeth*, *Exod.* 25. 17. in Greek *Hilasterion*, That is, the propitiatory or Mercy-Seat, *Hebr.* 9. 5. which name *Paul* giveth to Christ, *Rom.* 3. 25. and *he is the true propitiation for our sins*, 1 Joh. 2. 2. And saith he, in *Psal.* 78. 38. He being compassionate mercifully covered iniquity. And saith he, in *Psal.* 79. 9. mercifully cover our sins; he doth most fitly add the word *merciful*, to the word *cover*; because *Caporeth* is applied to the cover of the Ark, called Gods Mercy-Seat, where he used to appear and to manifest his favor, by the cloud of his presence, when he was attoned to his people, *Lev.* 16. 2. and so the word Merciful, or propitious, is added to Gods forgiving the sins of his people, in *Heb.* 8. 12. and such as confess their sins have the promise of Gods mercy, namely, of his merciful pardon, in *Prov.* 28. 13. By these, and such like considerations, we may see the reason why *David* useth this phrase, *Blessed is the man whose sin is covered*, *Psal.* 32. 1. namely, by Gods gracious forgiveness, for the sake of Christs propitiatory sacrifice.

The use of the burnt offering, saith *Ainsworth*, was to procure Gods attonement or remission of sins, as it is evident, saith he, by *Job* 42. 8. and so (saith he) the anger of God is (covered, or) appeased by the burnt offering of Christs, for he is the attonement or reconciliation for our sins, *Dan.* 9. 24. 1 *Joh.* 2. 2. *Heb.* 10. 18. 19.

Eighthly, After I had penned these meditations on the word Attonement, I met with another excellent explanation of it in our larger Annotations, in 2 *Chr.* 6. 49. The Reader may please to confer that note with these meditations.

Ninethly, It is also worth the marking, that the Seventy do render the Hebrew word *Caphar*, in various expressions, some of them I will name.

1. The Seventy do render the word *Caphar* to *sanctifie*, in *Exod.* 29. 33. There our Translation saith thus, *Aaron and his sons shall eat those things by which attonement was made*; But the Seventy say, *by which they were sanctified*: And so in ver. 36. our translation saith thus, *Thou shalt offer every day a bullock for a sin of Attonement*; The Seventy say, *for a sin, by which they shall be sanctified*; But I have opened this word sanctified before, in

Reply

Reply 3. And so it is said in *Heb.* 9. 13. *That the blood of Bulls and Goats, and the ashes of an Heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh,* for their legal Justification before God in his Sanctuary.

But when Christ came into the world he took away these legal sanctifications, and these bodily justifications, by the blood of Bulls, &c. and according to Gods will he established his own Sacrifice in the place of them; *by which will,* saith the Apostle, *we are sanctified,* namely, by Gods attonement and forgiveness, *Heb.* 10. 10, 14. that is to say, we are justified from our moral sins, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.

This exposition of the word *Caphar,* which is used to set out Gods covering of sin by his attonement, is by the Seventy translated Sanctified, and therefore it doth force us to take notice (but that we are dull of hearing) that a sinners righteousness in Gods sight doth stand in being sanctified or made sinless by Gods attonement and forgiveness; This kind of sanctification is our onely justification in Gods sight; For according to the understanding of the Seventy Interpreters, *Caphar,* the covering of sin by Gods attonement, did denominate the Jews to be legally sanctified to the purifying of their flesh, because by Gods attonement their impurity was removed, without putting any active purity upon their flesh, by any positive Ordinance.

This kind of sanctification therefore was a lively type of our moral justification, both by the meritorious cause of Christs Sacrifice, and by the formal cause of Gods Attonement.

2. The Seventy do render *Caphar,* to cleanse, as in *Exod.* 29. 37. and in *Exod.* 30. 10.

3. They render it to purge, in *Deut.* 32. 43. *Exod.* 30. 10. *Ps.* 65. 3. and these three differing expressions do but explain the former word Attonement, in our Translation, for in *Exod.* 29. 33, 36. it is in the same verse, it is also explained by the word sanctified, as *Synonima* to *Caphar,*

By these and such like terms given by the Seventy to *Caphar,* it is evident, that they understood, that when Gods angry face was attoned by sacrifice, in relation to their ceremonial sins,

that they were thereby sanctified, to the purifying of their flesh, *Heb.* 9. 13. and that thereby their persons were justified in respect of their appearing before Gods presence in his Sanctuary, or in regard of feasting with him on the holy flesh of the Passeover,
Heb. 9. 1, 10. or Peace-offerings; and in this respect they called such cleansings, justifications of divine Service, *Heb.* 9. 1. and carnal justifications, in v. 10. *viz.* Ceremonial, Ritual, and Typical, as Mr. *Trap* expounds it, or the righteousnes of the flesh, as I have more largely opened the matter a little before; and so also when the Temple was ceremonially purged from the pollutions of *Antiochus*, it is said in the Seventy, to be cleansed, but in the
Dan. 8. 14. Hebrew Text it is said to be justified, *Dan.* 8. 14.

Hence it follows by an unavoidable consequence, that their legal Ordinances by which they obtained Gods attonement, for their legal cleansings, sanctifyings, and justifyings, and for their legal righteousnes, did typifie and exemplifie how sinners are cleansed, washed, sanctified and justified, as it is expressed by these terms in 1 *Corinth.* 6. 11. and how they are made righteous by the righteousnes of the Law, as it is in *Rom.* 2. 26. and in *Rom.* 8. 4. namely, because the sacrifice of Christ is the fulfilling and end of all sacrifices, and of all other legal cleansings, and therefore it is the onely meritorious and procuring cause of Gods attonement and forgiveness, for the formal cleansing, washing, sanctifying, and justifying the conscience, from the accusing and condemning power of all moral sins, by which means we may stand before God as justified persons in his sight, when we come to put up our requests unto him, or to feast with him at the Lords Table; for when we come to the Lords Table, Gods forgiveness is the greatest and most precious dainty, for which Christ shed his blood; and therefore, at his last Supper he said thus to his Disciples, *This is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for the many, for the remission of sins*, *Mat.* 26. 28. according as it was promised in *Dan.* 9. 24. this dainty of Gods forgiveness, is the great purchase of Christs blood, which makes them blessed that have it, *Psa.* 32. 1. and makes them eternally righteous in Gods sight that have it, *Dan.* 9. 24. This, and a new heart, are the two great legacies of the new Covenant, *Jer.* 31. *Heb.* 8.

These things thus opened (me thinks) should so enlighten the eyes

eyes of our understanding to see what the righteousnes of God is, and to imbrace it as a most blessed truth, or at least, not to resist it, but to strive to understand it better, but when God will is to darken the understanding of men with erroneous conceptions, then the tongue of Angels cannot prevail with them to hold the contrary.

And thus have I in some measure opened this phrase, *The Righteousness of God by his Reconciliation or Attonement*, and I have opened the word *Attonement*, both in the meritorious and in the formal causes; namely, that Sacrifices for sin did meritoriously cover Gods angry face, attone, pacifie, reconcile, expiate, propitiate, purge, sanctifie, cleanse, and purifie, or make righteous a sinner, by procuring Gods attonement for his formal reconciliation, righteousnes, and justification.

And now methinks Mr. *Norton* may do well to consider of 1. unadvisednes in villifying this kind of attonement. And 2. In restraining it only to a covering of pitch, and such like tenacious matter, whereby he confounds both his own understanding and his Readers also.

The second part of *Mr. Nortons* comparative Arguments, in pag. 53. is this,

Christ was made sin, as he was made a curse; but he was made a curse by judicial imputation, therefore he was made sin by a real imputation.

Reply 10. In my examination of *Gal.* 3. 13. I have shewed how Christ was made a curse, and in the beginning of this Chapter I have shewed how he was made sin, therefore I shall not need to make any further reply here to these things, but refer the reader to those places.

2 The rest that he allegeth in p. 55. wherein he makes God to charge Christ with sin as a supreme Judge, according to the judicial way of Court proceedings, because it is no Scripture language in the point of Christs satisfaction, but devised terms to express his own erroneous conception, therefore I shall not need to give any other answer to it here.

CHAP. XV.

The Examination of Gal.3.13. with Deut.21.23.

Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law when he was made a curse for us; For it is written (in Deut.21.23.) Cursed is every one that hangeth upon a Tree.

THe Curse of hanging upon a Tree, which Christ suffered, the Dialogue doth expound of the outward curse which he suffered, in respect of the outward manner of his death, by hanging on a Tree.

But Mr. *Norton* in page 93.

Doth expound it, *Of the inward and eternal Curse, which he suffered from Gods immediate wrath, when he hung upon the Tree.*

SECT. I.

Mr. *Norton* frames his Argument thus:

If not only the Malediction of every one that is hanged on a Tree is held forth, but also Christs Redemption of us from the Curse of the Law, by being made a curse for us, is both held forth, and foretold in Deut.21.23. *then the Text in* Deut.21.23. *hath not only a proper, but a typical signification.*

But not only the Malediction of every one that is hanged on a Tree is held forth, but also Christs redemption of us from the curse of the Law, by being made a curse for us, is both held forth, and foretold in Deut.21.23.

Therefore the Text in Deut.21.23. *hath not only a proper, but typical signification.*

The

The minor saith Mr. *Norton*, *is the Apostles.*

Reply 1. Mr. *Norton* doth exceedingly abuse the Apostles meaning, to say that his *minor* is the Apostles, and also in saying that the Apostle doth cite *Deut.*21.23. to prove that our Redemption by Christ is both held forth and foretold there.

But for the better finding out of the Apostles meaning in *Gal.*3.13.

There are two distinct clauses in the fomer part of the verse that are of necessity to be well marked.

1 That Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law.

2 That he was made a curse for us.

These two clauses the Dialogue hath expressed thus.

1 Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law.

2 When he was made a curse for us.

Now saith the Dialogue, the Apostle cites *Deut.*21.23. only to prove the last clause, namely, That Christ was made a curse for us in the outward manner of his death, like unto other notorious Malefactors, even at the same time when he redeemed us from the curse of the Law, by making the formality of his death to bee a sacrifice, by his own Priestly power.

2 It is further evident, that this sense is the truth, by the prediction of it from the time of *Adams* fall, in *Gen.*3.15. Thou Sathan shalt pierce him as a sinful Malefactor on the Tree, and yet hee shall break thy Head-plot at the very same time, by his obedience to the death; for in all his conflict with thy ignominious torturing paint on the Cross, he shall not suffer his patience to bee disturbed, nor his obedience to bee perverted, but hee shall continue obedient to the death, even the death of the Cross; and in that obedience, as soon as thou hast done thy worst to disturb it, and as soon as hee hath finished all his sufferings, hee shall make his death a sacrifice by his own Priestly power; And it is recorded of him, that as soon as he had but said, *It is finished*, he bowed his head, and gave up the Ghost; and that was the formality both of his death and sufferings; And thus hee brake the Devils Head-plot, had the victory

The outward manner of Christs death on the Tree, was first declared in Gen. 3.15.

and

and won the prize which was the redemption of all the Elect, even at the same time when hee was put to death, as a cursed Malefactor, by the Devil, in hanging on a Tree.

This was the declared platform of the Trinity according to their eternal Covenant for mans Redemption, as I have expressed it in the Dialogue, but have often in this book amplified and inlarged it.

3 It is worth the marking, that the Apostle doth not put the Article *The*, to the word *Curse*, cited from *Deut.* 21. 23. but only to the first word *Curse*, as it is cited in verse 10. from *Deut.* 27. But in case the latter word Curse had included the moral Curse, as well as the former word *Curse*, then in reason it should have had the Article [*The*] put to it, as well as it is to the former; but because it is not put to the latter, therefore this may serve as another Argument to prove the Apostle meant that Christ suffered no other Curse, but such a Curse as his proof meant, namely, a cursed death in the outward manner of it, just like unto those Malefactors that were hanged on a Tree, according to *Deut.* 21. 23. and *Gen.* 3. 15. And to this sense doth *Chrysostom* and *Theophilact* expound the Curse that Christ suffered, cited in the former Chapter, namely, that he suffered on a Tree as if he had been a sinner, for he was put to death as a sinner by the Devils imputation, but not by Gods imputation; if hee had suffered as a sinner from Gods immediate wrath, and by Gods imputation, then hee must some way or other have had communion with our guilt; For (saith *Grotius* afore cited) merit is personal; and therefore when the Ancient Divines say, Hee suffered on a Tree, as if he had been a sinner, they mean it only in respect of the likeness of his punishment unto other cursed Malefactors, which punishment an innocent person may suffer as well as a Malefactor. And so *Austin* (saith well) that Christ received our punishment without sin, that thereby hee might dissolve our sin, and end our punishment.

And in relation to this sense the Dialogue doth open the Apostles words thus, Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law, even at the same time [*when*] hee was made (not that Curse in verse 10. But) a curse for us, according to *Deut.* 21. 23.

But

But, saith Mr. *Norton*, *the word* [When] *is not in the Text, but it is of your own putting in.*

Reply 2. It is a usual thing with Mr. *Norton*, to censure the Dialogue with some odious thing or other, without any just cause; But by his leave the Dialogue is able to justifie it self, by the concurrence of good Authors, for this word *When*.

1 Mr. *Perkins* doth use the word *When* twice over:
First, In his translation of this Text.
And secondly, In his Analysis.

2 Mr. *Ainsworth* doth render this Text thus, Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law, *When* hee was made a curse for us, in *Exod* 32.32.

3 Mr. *Calvin* in his citation of this Text, doth put in the word (*When*) just as Mr. *Ainsworth* hath done, in his *Inst. lib.2. Chap.16. Sect 6.*

4 The Prophet *Isaiah* useth the word *When* just in this very case, saying, in *Isa.*53.10. *It pleased the Lord to bruise him, and to put him to grief* (on the Tree) *When hee shall make his soul a Trespass*, namely, a Trespass, or a Sin-sacrifice, as the Septuagint render *Asham*. Isa.53.10.

5 The Syriak doth translate it *And* (or *When*) hee was made a Curse for us; *Vau* in Syriak and Hebrew, is usually put for *And*, and yet it is sometimes also put for *When*; and therefore *Tremelius* doth render it in to Latine, *Dum pro nobis factus est execratio*; and *Erasmus* doth translate the Greek thus, *Dum pro nobis*, which doth answer to our English word *When* or *While*.

6 *Tindal* doth translate *Gal.*3.13. by *And*, and not by *Being*.

7 The Greek word in *Gal.*3.13. is often put for *When* by our Translators, as in *Mat.*14.3. and in *Luke* 22.44. in these places it is translated into Syriak, *Vau*, into Latine, *Dum*, and into English (*When*) he was in *Bethany*, and *When* he was in an Agony, and therefore by the like reason, it may as well bee translated, *When* hee was made a Curse for us.

8 It seems to mee therefore that Mr. *Norton* doth find fault

with the Dialogue, from no other cause, but because the word *When* doth utterly spoyl the visage of the Argument, for it is no way suitable to his typical sense, on which the foundation of his Argument doth depend, and therefore it is no marvel, that he doth censure the Dialogue for putting it into the Text.

9 All Christs greatest sufferings are comprised under the word Chastisement, in *Isa.*53.5. *The Chastisement of our peace was upon him*; namely, *When he was wounded for our transgressions, and when bee was bruised for our iniquities.* But if the moral Curse had been upon him when he was thus wounded and bruised on the Cross, then the word Chastisement had not been fit to express it, for we cannot find in all the Scriptures where the vindicative wrath of God, and the torments of Hell, are called Chastisements.

If Mr. *Norton* had not been transported with a high conceit of his own erronious Tenents, he would never have stumbled so as he doth at the word *When* in the Dialogue.

But Mr. *Norton* goes on in page 93. to prove his *minor*, by the causal particle [*For*] *by which* (saith he) *the Apostle doth prove the foregoing part of the Text.*

Reply 3. But I demand which foregoing part of the Text doth Mr. *Norton* mean that the Apostle doth prove, for I have formerly shewed that there are two distinct clauses in the former part of the verse.

1 It is said, *That Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law.*

2 It is said, *That he was made a curse for us.*

If hee mean it of both these clauses, then I deny that the causal particle [*For*] was so intended by the Apostle, for I have before shewed, that the Apostle did intend it only to confirm the last clause, namely, *That Christ was made a curse for us in the outward manner of his death.*

2 Mr. *Norton* in page 94. proves his former expositon thus:

If these words in Gal.3.13. *Cursed is every one that hangs on a tree,*

and

and that text in Deut.21.23. *Curſed is every one that hangs on a tree, have both but one and the ſame ſenſe, Then* (ſaith hee) *what hinders, that the foregoing part of the verſe,* namely, *Redemption, &c.*

Reply 4. What hinders (ſaith Mr. *Norton*) hee knows well that Interrogations are no Arguments to prove what hee affirms, he ſhould have proved his affirmative, and not demanded the queſtion, What hinders?

Than which Inference, ſaith he, in page 94. *what is more abominable, the typical reaſon excepted of ſignifying* (or typifying) *Chriſt bearing the mortal curſe upon the tree.*

Reply 5. The Reader muſt here take ſpecial notice that Mr. *Norton* doth lay the weight of all his Arguments on the typical ſenſe, but you ſhall ſee ere long that his typical ſenſe drawn from *Deut.*21.23. will as much fail him (as his typical ſenſe of the Tree of life hath done, as I have already ſhewed in Chap.2. Sect.3.) and then all his Arguments that are built upon it, will prove but groundleſs fantaſies, or to uſe his own language, hee will put an abominable inference on the Apoſtle, and on the Spirit of God ſpeaking by him.

SECT. II.

But ſaith Mr. *Norton* in page 94.

There can be no ſufficient or probable reaſon given, why hanging upon a tree ſhould infame and faſten upon the perſon hanged this ſpecial Curſe; Whence followed the defiling of the land in caſe the body continued unburied after Sun-ſet, above all other capital ſufferings. And, ſaith he, in page 96. *in caſe they be not buried before Sun-ſet they ſhall defile the land. And,* ſaith he, in page 102. *the principal ſcope of this text* (of Deut.21.23.) *is to give a Law concerning him that is hanged, that he ſhould in any wiſe be buried that day, with the reaſon thereof annexed.* And in page 95. hee cites *Junius* to his typical expoſition.

1 I will give a reason why hanging on a tree is the greatest curse of all death.

And secondly, that his not burial afore Sun-set, doth not defile the whole land.

Reply 6. The Dialogue hath given a probable reason, yea a certain reason, why the Malefactor that was hanged upon a tree, was infamed with a greater curse than any other death.

Stoning to death was counted the heaviest kind of death of all deaths, in relation to the infamy of hanging up the dead body to be gazed on, for their greater reproach, for the hanging of the dead body was usually annexed to stoning to death.

1 Saith the Dialogue in page 68. Not every sinner that deserved death by [*Thou*] the Sanhedrim is meant of this high degree of curse in their death, but such sinners only as deserved to have their bodies hanged on a tree after they were stoned to death; for God had given power to the Sanhedrim when they stoned Malefactors to death, if the circumstances of their sin were of a high consideration, to hang up their dead bodies on a tree, for their greater reproach, shame, and ignominy, and to be a spectacle to others, as long as the Sun gave light, but yet in any wise to bury him that day, and thus *Calvin* on *Deut.* 21.21. and *Goodwin* on *Moses* Rites, and Mr. *Ainsworth* on *Deut.* 21.22. do accord with the Dialogue that hanging is for the greater curse after stoning to death.

2 Saith the Dialogue, the rebellious Son in *Deut.*21.21. is brought as an instance of this double punishment.

First, He was stoned to death.

And then secondly, His dead body was hanged on a tree to be gazed on for his further reproach and infamy, and so for a higher degree of curse than his stoning to death was; and from this particular instance, *Moses* doth infer in vers.22. *That if there be in a man* (that is to say in any other man besides the Rebellious Son) *a sin* (that is to say, any other capital sin) *that is worthy of death* (that is to say, of this double kind of death) *And Thou* (namely, Thou the high Sanhedrim) *do hang him upon a tree* (that is to say, after he hath been stoned to death) *his body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but thou shalt bury him that day, because he had satisfied the curse of God.*

3 It is manifest, That this kind of death was accounted not only of the Jews, but of other Nations the most infamous of all kind of death; *Moses* in *Num.* 25.4. said, *Take the Princes,*

and

and hang them up before the Sun; The Seventy tranſlate it, *make them open ſpectacles of ſhame*; for though other kinds of death were dreadful, yet none ſo ſhameful as this kind of death, and the curſe of it is laid more on the ſhame than on the pain; for in all other kinds of death, as ſoon as the life was taken away by the executioners, the body was preſently taken away out of ſight, and covered from further reproach; but theſe kind of perſons that were firſt ſtoned to death, and after hanged on a tree, were therefore hanged, that they might be a ſpectacle of further ſhame and reproach. Or in caſe they were hanged alive, according to the *Roman* manner, and left hanging a certain time after their death to be a gazing ſtock, a by-word, and a reproach, then that made that kind of death to be an accurſed death above all other kinds of death; For to be under the ſhame and reproach of men is a great curſe of God; and therefore ſhame, reproach, taunts, by-words, and curſes, are all joyned together, as terms Synonimas, in *Jer.*24.9. in *Jer.*42.18. in *Jer.* 44.8,12. And for an innocent to bear theſe ignominious curſes, it muſt needs be a very dreadful thing to the outward man, though his innocency may bear up his inward man, as it doth in Martyrs, and as it did in Chriſt, *Heb.*12.2. And ſeeing the Devil, by Gods declared permiſſion, had power to put Chriſt to this ignominious, and long lingring violent death, as it is expreſſed, in *Gen.*3.15. therefore it was Gods will that Chriſt ſhould be ſenſible of it in the affections of his ſoul, and in that reſpect his humane nature was often much troubled at the conſideration of it, as in *Pſal.*69.7. There Chriſt ſaith thus, *For thy ſake have I born reproach, ſhame hath covered my face*: It was thy declared will and command, in *Gen.*3.15. that I ſhould combate with Satan, with mans true nature and affections, and that he ſhould have power to uſe me as a malefactor, with the greateſt ignominy that he could invent, and at laſt peirce me in the foot-ſoals, as a moſt ignominious malefactor, on the tree; and I muſt be ſenſible of all this, as I am true man, of the ſeed of the woman. And therefore I ſay in ver.9. *The reproaches of them that reproached thee, are fallen on me*; and therefore I ſay in verſ.20. *Reproach hath broken my heart, and I am full of heavineſs*: Theſe expreſſions of his ſoul-ſorrows, do tell us the true cauſe of Chriſts fear, ſadneſs, and agony in the Garden, in *Matth.*

26.37,38. *Mark.*14.34,35. and saith he, in *Psa.*22.6. *I am a worm and no man, a reproach of men, and the despised of the people. All that see me laugh me to scorn, they shoot out the lip, they shake the head, saying, he trusted on the Lord that he would deliver him, let him deliver him, seeing he delighted in him.* These words do directly relate to the shame of his death on the cross, as *Matthew* doth open the sense, in *Matth.* 27.39,43. and therefore his kind of death is called *The scandal of the cross*, *Gal.*5.11. And his suffering on the cross without the gate is called *His reproach*, *Heb.*13.13. and reproach is a dreadful thing to the Saints, and therefore they pray in *Psal.* 119.22. *Remove far from me reproach and contempt*, and in vers.31. *Put me not to shame.* And in *Psal.*89,50,51. *Remember Lord, the reproach of thy servants, wherewith thine enemies have reproached, O Lord, where with they have reproached the footsteps of thine anointed.* And therefore Christ, in *Psal.*40.16. doth imprecate this curse upon them that brought this curse of shame upon him; *Let them be desolate for a reward of their shame, that say unto me, aha, aha*; For saith Christ, in *Psal.*109.25. *I became a reproach unto them* (on the cross) *they looked upon me, they shaked their heads.*

And we see by experience, that men do account the shame of death to be worse than the pains of death, and therefore *Saul* desired his Armor-bearer, rather to kill him, than the Philistims should come and mock him at his death, 1 *Sam.* 31.4. and *Abimeleck* willed his Armor-bearer to kill him, rather than men should say, to his greater shame, that a woman had killed him, *Judg.*5.54. for the more shame, the more curse of God is in any death. And the custom among the Jews was not to put malefactors to death by hanging, but they used to hang up the dead body after it was stoned to death, for the greater infamy to the sin and sinner; therefore hanging among them was not used to denote the curse in respect of the pains of death, but onely to set forth the curse of shame and reproach, and therefore hanging among them could not be a type of the pains of the eternal curse.

But secondly, It was the custom of the *Romans* to put the basest sort of Malefactors to death by hanging, and after death to let them hang for a time to be a spectacle of ignominy and reproach, and therefore the pains of death was in that curse though,

though, chiefly, the ſhame is intended by the Apoſtle in *Gal.* 3.13. becauſe it relates to the curſe of hanging in *Deut.* 21. 23. *mortis modus morte pejor.*

And the Hebrew Doctors ſay, they bewailed not him that went to be executed, but onely mourned inwardly for him; they bewailed him not that (ſo ſay they) his diſgrace might be his expiation; they it ſeems, accounted that the more ſhame and puniſhment a condemned perſon ſuffered, the more it tended to the expiation of his ſin from the Land. See Dr. *Lightfoots* Harmony on the New Teſtament, p. 71. And Chriſt told his Diſciples of the ignominiouſneſs of his death by the *Romans*, that *the Prieſts and Scribes ſhould deliver him to the Gentiles, to mock, and to ſcourge, and to crucifie him.* And the ſtory of the Evangeliſts doth at large ſet forth the greatneſs of the curſe that was in his death, by mockings and revilings.

1 They mocked his Prophetical Office, ſaying, *Prophecy who it is that ſmote thee*, Mat. 26.68.

2 They ſcoffed his Prieſtly Office, ſaying, *He ſaved others, himſelf he cannot ſave*, Mat. 27.42.

3 They mocked his Kingly Office, ſaying, *Hail King of the Jews*, Mat. 27. 28. and ſaid, *They had no King but* Cæſar, Joh. 19.15.

Theſe, and ſuch like expreſſions, do ſet out the ſcandal of his croſs, and ſo the greatneſs of the curſe, which Satan with all his might did multiply in a tranſcendent manner upon him, if by any means he could diſturb his patience, and ſo pervert him in the courſe of his obedience, that ſo his death might not be a ſacrifice, and then Satan had got the victory; but becauſe Chriſt continued obedient to the death, even to the death of the croſs, and at laſt made his ſoul a ſacrifice by his own Prieſtly power, therefore he broke the Devils head, and got the victory, and ſo he won the prize.

And thus have I given a ſufficient reaſon why thoſe that were hanged on a tree were infamed with a greater curſe of reproach than was by any other ſort of capital death that was in uſe among the *Jews* or *Romans.*

Secondly, I come now to examine the time of their burial.

And

And thirdly, Whether the Land was defiled in case they continued unburied till after Sun-set.

For Mr. *Norton* saith, *That in case the body that was hanged, did continue unburied till after Sun-set, it caused the whole land to be defiled ceremonially.*

The time of the burial of the person hanged might be after sun-set provided it were done within the compass of the same natural day which lasted till midnight.

Reply 7. The time of the burial of the person hanged is not (by the Text, *Deut.*21.23.) limited to sun-set, as Mr *Norton* doth wrest the words of the Text to speak; But the time limited in the Text is this, *He shall not hang all night upon the tree, but thou shalt bury him the same day*; Mark the phrase, *He shall not hang all night*; Hence it follows, that he might hang some part of the night, so he did not hang all night; that is to say, he might hang some part of the night, provided they did bury him within the limits of the same natural day, for the words of the Text are thus, *He shall not hang all night, but thou shalt bury him the same day*: And I have at large shewed in my Treatise of *Holy Time*, that the same natural day was not ended till midnight, and see more in Sect.8. In like sort, the Peace-offerings were commanded to be eaten the same day, in which they were offered, *Lev.*7.15. and yet they might be eaten after sun-set, as the speech of the Harlot doth shew, in *Prov.*7.9. and for this see *Ainsw.* in *Lev.*7.15,18. and in *Lev.*22.30.

Prov. 7. 9.

Secondly, in this particular case of hanging, we see that *Joshua* did permit the King of *Ai* to continue hanging on the tree until the Sun was down, *Josh.*8.29. and therefore seeing he did not command his carkass to be taken down from the tree untill the sun was set, it follows, that his carkass could not be buried before sun-set. And thus his crutch is fallen, and therefore all his conclusions that are built thereon are fallen with it, as his language is to me.

Josh. 8. 29.

Thirdly, Though Mr. *Norton* do cite *Junius* to his typical sense, yet I find by conference, that *Junius* not many lines before those words cited by Mr. *Norton*, doth plainly deny that the carkass thus hanged did defile the land, although it remained unburied after sun-set; he doth rather place the defiling of the land in the act of the Judges, in case they suffered the carkass to continue unburied that day, after the justice of the Law was satisfied (which

See *Junius* parallel. l. 2. paral. 51.

(which was ordinarily ſatisfied with that days infamy) and to this purpoſe alſo doth the Geneva note ſpeak. But I will preſently produce another reaſon why the Judges were exhorted not to defile the land.

Fourthly, It is very probable by his words, in pag.102. that Mr. *Norton* doth ſteer his judgement in this point, *of defiling the Land*, by following the ſenſe of a corrupt Tranſlation; I mean by following the latter Editions of King *Jameſes* Tranſlation; for the latter Editions are corrupted from the integrity of the firſt Editions. It is moſt likely that ſome left-handed perſon (that happily was of Mr. *Nortons* judgement) did venture too boldly to alter the Tranſlation from the integrity of the firſt Editions, for the firſt Editions, both the Church Bible, and ſome others do run thus, *His body ſhall not remain all night upon the tree: But thou ſhalt in any wiſe bury him that day, for he that is hanged is accurſed of God.* The latter Editions of King *Jameſes* Tranſlation of Deut. 21. 23. is corrupted from the integrity of the firſt Editions.

At the end of this ſentence [*He that is hanged is accurſed of God*] they ſet a colon, or two pricks; And then follows another diſtinct ſentence, thus,

That thy Land be not defiled.]

But in the latter Editions, there is a great corruption made, for firſt, The colon is omitted. And ſecondly, There is a parentheſis added to incloſe the former ſentence thus,

(*For he that is hanged is accurſed of God.*)

This ſentence thus incloſed doth quite alter the ſenſe, and makes the exhortation to the Judges to concur with Mr. *Nortons* ſenſe, thus, *Thou ſhalt in any wiſe bury him that day, that thy land be not defiled.*

Now according to this corrupt Tranſlation, and the onely reaſon given why the perſon hanged muſt be buried the ſame day, is, becauſe elſe the land would be defiled.

But put out the parentheſis, and put in the colon, as it was in the firſt Editions, and then the words will have a quite differing ſenſe.

I grant that the leaving out of the colon might happen through the Printers over-ſight, but the incloſing of that ſentence in a parentheſis, could not be done by the Printers overſight, but doubtleſs that was done on purpoſe by ſome left handed perſon, as I obſerved before.

I doe therefore earneſtly intreat the judicious Presbytery

And thirdly, Whether the Land was defiled in case they continued unburied till after Sun-set.

For Mr. *Norton* saith, *That in case the body that was hanged, did continue unburied till after Sun-set, it caused the whole land to be defiled ceremonially.*

The time of the burial of the person hanged might be after sun-set provided it were done within the compass of the same natural day which lasted till midnight.

Reply 7. The time of the burial of the person hanged is not (by the Text, *Deut.*21.23.) limited to sun-set, as Mr *Norton* doth wrest the words of the Text to speak; But the time limited in the Text is this, *He shall not hang all night upon the tree, but thou shalt bury him the same day*; Mark the phrase, *He shall not hang all night*; Hence it follows, that he might hang some part of the night, so he did not hang all night; that is to say, he might hang some part of the night, provided they did bury him within the limits of the same natural day, for the words of the Text are thus, *He shall not hang all night, but thou shalt bury him the same day*: And I have at large shewed in my Treatise of *Holy Time*, that the same natural day was not ended till midnight, and see more in Sect.8. In like sort, the Peace-offerings were commanded to be eaten the same day, in which they were offered, *Lev.*7.15. and yet they might be eaten after sun-set, as the speech of the Harlot doth shew, in *Prov.*7.9. and for this see *Ainsw.* in *Lev.*7.15,18. and in *Lev.*22.30.

Prov. 7. 9.

Secondly, in this particular case of hanging, we see that *Joshua* did permit the King of *Ai* to continue hanging on the tree until the Sun was down, *Josh.*8.29. and therefore seeing he did not command his carkass to be taken down from the tree untill the sun was set, it follows, that his carkass could not be buried before sun-set. And thus his crutch is fallen, and therefore all his conclusions that are built thereon are fallen with it, as his language is to me.

Josh. 8. 29.

Thirdly, Though Mr. *Norton* do cite *Junius* to his typical sense, yet I find by conference, that *Junius* not many lines before those words cited by Mr. *Norton*, doth plainly deny that the carkass thus hanged did defile the land, although it remained unburied after sun-set; he doth rather place the defiling of the land in the act of the Judges, in case they suffered the carkass to continue unburied that day, after the justice of the Law was satisfied

See *Junius* parallel.l.2.paral. 51.

(which

(which was ordinarily ſatisfied with that days infamy) and to this purpoſe alſo doth the Geneva note ſpeak. But I will preſently produce another reaſon why the Judges were exhorted not to defile the land.

Fourthly, It is very probable by his words, in pag.102. that Mr. *Norton* doth ſteer his judgement in this point, *of defiling the Land*, by following the ſenſe of a corrupt Tranſlation; I mean by following the latter Editions of King *Jameſes* Tranſlation; for the latter Editions are corrupted from the integrity of the firſt Editions. It is moſt likely that ſome left-handed perſon (that happily was of Mr. *Nortons* judgement) did venture too boldly to alter the Tranſlation from the integrity of the firſt Editions, for the firſt Editions, both the Church Bible, and ſome others do run thus, *His body ſhall not remain all night upon the tree: But thou ſhalt in any wiſe bury him that day, for he that is hanged is accurſed of God.*

The latter Editions of King *Jameſes* Tranſlation of Deut. 21. 23. is corrupted from the integrity of the firſt Editions.

At the end of this ſentence [*He that is hanged is accurſed of God*] they ſet a colon, or two pricks; And then follows another diſtinct ſentence, thus,

That thy Land be not defiled.]

But in the latter Editions, there is a great corruption made, for firſt, The colon is omitted. And ſecondly, There is a parentheſis added to incloſe the former ſentence thus,

(*For he that is hanged is accurſed of God.*)

This ſentence thus incloſed doth quite alter the ſenſe, and makes the exhortation to the Judges to concur with Mr. *Nortons* ſenſe, thus, *Thou ſhalt in any wiſe bury him that day, that thy land be not defiled.*

Now according to this corrupt Tranſlation, and the onely reaſon given why the perſon hanged muſt be buried the ſame day, is, becauſe elſe the land would be defiled.

But put out the parentheſis, and put in the colon, as it was in the firſt Editions, and then the words will have a quite differing ſenſe.

I grant that the leaving out of the colon might happen through the Printers over-ſight, but the incloſing of that ſentence in a parentheſis, could not be done by the Printers over-ſight, but doubtleſs that was done on purpoſe by ſome left handed perſon, as I obſerved before.

I doe therefore earneſtly intreat the judicious Presbytery

to make ſearch into this matter; and to cauſe a Reformation in the next Editions, according to the integrity of the firſt.

Fifthly, Let the Text in *Deut.*21.23. be read according to the firſt Editions, and then it will follow, that the onely true reaſon why he that hanged on a tree muſt be buried the ſame day, is, (not becauſe elſe the land would be defiled, but) becauſe he that is hanged---- the curſe of God; ſo the Hebrew is tranſlated in the margin: But there is in this ſentence a defect, or a want of ſome word, which our Tranſlaters have ſupplied in the Text by the word (*is*) and ſo they make the Text to run thus, *He that is hanged* (*is*) *the curſe of God.* But the Seventy, with *Aquila*, and *Theodotian* read it thus, *He is the curſe of God that is hanged*; and *Symachus* reads it thus, becauſe *for the blaſphemy of God he is hanged*; And the Chalde paraphraſe doth render it thus: for becauſe *he ſinned before the Lord, hee is hanged.*

See *Forſbel* on Juſtif. p.131.

Theſe ſeveral Tranſlations and Expoſitions are conſiderable; But yet ſtill for all this, it is a queſtion of ſome moment, in what ſenſe hee that is hanged is called the curſe of God? Is he ſtill the object of Gods curſe upon the land, as he was whilſt he lived in the practiſe of his ſin, before his hanging? ſurely that cannot be, ſeeing juſtice was executed, and therefore it follows, that he is now called the curſe of God, becauſe his hanging ſo long upon a tree, to be gazed on as a viſible curſe, was to ſhew their greater deteſtation of his ſin, and ſo to ſatisfie the curſe of Gods Juſtice, and ſo to pacifie his wrath, and ſo to avert the curſe, which elſe would certainly have been poured out upon the land, in caſe the Magiſtrates had neglected this point of juſtice, but becauſe the viſible curſe of his ſin was thus eminently put upon him by the Magiſtrates, by hanging up his dead body on a tree, that he might be the Spectacle thereof as long as the Sun gave any light; The Judges were admoniſhed, not to turn Juſtice into cruelty, by letting his dead body to continue hanging upon the tree all night, but in any wiſe to bury him that day, namely, before that natural day was ended (which ended at midnight, as I have ſhewed in my Treatiſe of *Holy Time*) and the reaſon is added, *Becauſe he that is hanged---the curſe of God*; namely, becauſe he that is hanged hath born the viſible curſe, and thereby hath averted the curſe

of

of God, which else would certainly have been poured out upon the land, In case this malefactor had been suffered to live still in his sin, and so justice being satisfied he must be buried out of sight that day.

And hence it follows, that he was called the curse of God after that Gods justice was satisfied by the figure Metonymia, as the sacrifice that was ordained to attone God for sin, was called sin.

The true reason why he that was hanged must be buried the same day, was because his stoning to death and his hanging on a tree afterwards had appeased Gods anger, and so removed the curse from the Land.

So then the true reason, why the Judges were admonished not to let his carkass that was hanged continue hanging all night, but to bury him the same day, to cover and hide his carkass in the earth from further publick shame and ignominy, because he had already satisfied Justice, by hanging on a tree to be gazed on, as long as the day light made him a spectacle, which at some time of the year might be till it was near midnight, where the natural day endeth: So then the defect or want in the Hebrew Text may be supplied by any word or words that do explain the true sense, as well as by (*in*;) As thus, thou shalt in any wise bury him the same day, for he that is hanged to be gazed on as long as the day gives light to be gazed on, hath appeased God, and born the curse from the land, and thereby he hath made attonement for the curse, and so procured Gods favor to the Land.

And it is most evident by three remarkable examples, that the execution of the visible curse upon such malefactors did procure attonement to the land.

First, The Lord himself commanded *Moses* to take the chief Ring-leaders of them that had coupled them to *Baal Peor*, and to hang them up before the Lord against the Sun, *Numb.* 25.4. Numb. 25. 4.

1 It must be done before the Lord, namely, openly by the publick Judges, for God is still with them in the cause and judgement, 2 *Chron.* 19.6. *Deut.* 17.1. *Psa.* 82.1.

2 It must be done against the Sun, namely in the open view of all persons, as long as the Sun did give any light upon the face of the earth, and because *Phinees* did execute judgement upon some of the chief of these sinners, therefore in ver. 13. he is said *to make attonement for Israel.*

Secondly, *David* commanded the seven sons of *Saul* to be han-

2 Sam. 21. 9. ged up before the Lord, 2 *Sam.* 21. 9. namely, by the ſentence of juſtice, but the *Gibeonites* ſaid to *David* in v. 6. *We will hang them up to the Lord*, namely, to appeaſe his fierce anger againſt the land, and in that reſpect their hanging is ſaid in ver. 3. to make attonement; and to this ſenſe the Chalde paraphraſe doth render the ſenſe of *Deu.* 21. 23. for *becauſe he ſinned before the Lord he is hanged*, namely, to appeaſe his wrath.

And all that are hanged before the Lord, that is to ſay, openly, by the ſentence of theſe Judges, are ſaid alſo to be hanged up to the Lord to appeaſe his wrath, and ſo both phraſes do demonſtrate the ſame thing, and thus to do Juſtice and Judgement upon ſinners, is more acceptable to the Lord, to attone his wrath, than ſacrifice, *Pro.* 21. 3.

Thirdly, *Achan* was a curſed perſon in his death (though his dead body was not hanged but burnt with fire) becauſe he had ſinned in the curſed thing, namely, in the conſecrated gold which God had curſed to any that did purloin it; and therefore God ſaid unto *Joſhua*, *I will be with you no more except yee deſtroy that curſed perſon*, Joſh. 7. 12. For *Iſrael hath tranſgreſſed the Covenant which I commanded them*, ver. 11. But why doth he ſay, that *Iſrael* tranſgreſſed, ſeeing *Achan* alone ſinned in a ſecret manner. The Anſwer is, Becauſe it was Gods will to make ſuch a ſupream voluntary Law and Covenant with all *Iſrael*, that if but one man ſinned in the excommunicate thing, it ſhould involve all *Iſrael* under the curſe, *Joſh.* 6. 18. untill they had purged themſelves by the uſe of means to find out the tranſgreſſor, but as ſoon as they had found out the tranſgreſſor, and had executed Juſtice, and buried his burnt body under a heap of ſtones, the Lord was appeaſed to the people, and turned from his fierce wrath, *Joſh.* 7. 25, 26. and ſo the Camp was cleanſed.

Hence I do once more conclude, that the onely true reaſon why he that was hanged, muſt be buried the ſame day, was (not becauſe elſe the Land would be ceremonially defiled, as Mr. *Norton* doth argue, but) becauſe one days open hanging on a tree, as long as the light did laſt to be gazed on, did ſatisfie Gods Juſtice, and pacifie his wrath, and therefore the Judges are admoniſhed not to let his body hang all night, but in any caſe to bury him the ſame day, becauſe he that is thus hanged hath born the

the curſe that elſe would have fallen on the land; and the Jews ſay, That as ſoon as a Malefactor had ſatisfied juſtice by his death, then the tree whereon he was hanged, the ſword, ſtone, or napkin, wherewith ſuch a one was executed, muſt be buried with them, that no evill memorial of them might remain, to ſay, this was the tree, ſword, ſtone, or napkin, wherewith ſuch a one was executed. See Trap on Gal. 3. 13.

But ſtill this muſt bee remembred, that in ſome extraordinary caſes, God permitted the Magiſtrates to let ſome notorious Malefactors to hang on a Tree, not only for one day, but alſo for many dayes together, and yet the land was not defiled, but cleanſed thereby; of which ſee more in *n.* 8.

6 Having now finiſhed the former reaſon why the perſon hanged muſt be buried the ſame day, namely, becauſe in the ordinary courſe of juſtice one dayes hanging on a tree, did ſatisfie Gods juſtice, and ſo remove the curſe from the land, as it is expreſſed in this ſentence, *He that is hanged (hath born) the curſe of God*: And at the end of this ſentence, the *Geneva* and *Tindal* have made a full ſtop, and the other Tranſlations have made a colon, or a half ſtop, for the time of his burial: Then *Moſes* proceeds in the next ſentence to finiſh his former exhortation to the Judges (in verſe 22.) *That thy land be not defiled, which the Lord thy God giveth thee to inherit*; the Context, verſe 22. lies thus, *If there be in thee a man*, namely, *any other man* (beſides the Rebellious Son, in verſe 18.) *that hath committed a ſin worthy of death*, namely, *by ſtoning, thou ſhalt ſtone him to death, and then if thou ſee cauſe, thou ſhalt hang up his dead body on a tree, that thy land bee not defiled by ſuffering ſuch notorious moral ſins, and ſinners to go unpuniſhed.*

This is the only true reaſon according to the Context, why the Judges are exhorted to execute exemplary juſtice on ſuch notorious moral ſinners; namely, that the land by their neglect of juſtice be not defiled, for the Judges were the whole land Repreſentatively (as I have ſhewed more at large in the Jews Synagogues Diſcipline.) The whole land might be defiled by the Judges neglect in ſuffering notorious Malefactors to go unpuniſhed.

And it is evident not only by the Context, that this was the true mind and meaning of *Moſes* in his exhortation to the Judges, not to defile the land by pretermitting the execution of exemplary juſtice on ſuch notorious Malefactors, but alſo it

is further evident by comparing his exhortation here, with the like exhortations to the Judges, to cleanse the land from moral defilements, by executing of exact justice against such moral sinners, which else would defile the whole land, yea or any other land as well as the land of *Canaan*, in case the Magistrates thereof did neglect to execute impartial justice, and to tollerate moral sinners. See *Lev.* 18,24,25,27,28. *Num.* 35. 31, 32,33. *Psal.*106.38. *Ezra* 9.11. *Jer.*3.1,2,9. *Jer.*16.18. *Ezek.* 36.17. *Psal.*24.5. *&c.*

But it came to pass, that when *Phineas* by his extraordinary zeal, did execute justice upon some of the most notorious Malefactors in *Num.*25. that the plague was stayed, and then the land was cleansed; for by this act of justice (though he was no Magistrate) yet being stirred up of God in an extraordinary way, to execute the office of a Magistrate, hee is said to make Attonement, or to reconcile God to the whole land, *Num.*25.23. See *Ainsworth* also in *Num.*35.33,39.

These, and such like instances, do evidence that the Judges (as they were the Representatives of the whole land) might defile the whole land, and make them guilty of Gods curse due to such notorious moral sinners, in case they did connive at them, and not execute impartial justice upon them: And this is the scope of *Moses* exhortation to the Judges, not to defile the land; and not as Mr. *Norton* makes the exhortation to bee, to bury the body before Sun-set, that the land bee not defiled.

On the contrary, when the Judges were careful to execute exemplary justice on such notorious Malefactors, they are said to cleanse the land from the objects of Gods wrath, and to make Attonement for the Land.

O that this Exhortation of Moses *might sit fast in the conscience of all Magistrates, both supreme and inferiour, to execute impartial justice against moral sinners, that so they may cleanse the land of the Objects of Gods wrath, and that the land by their neglect, might not be defiled!*

And O that people would rightly use their liberty, when they have any hand in the choice of Magistrates, to chuse such as fear God, and hate sin!

7 It is moſt evident that the whole Land was never defiled, by any one tranſgreſſion againſt the Ceremonial Law; I wonder therefore at Mr. *Nortons* unadviſedneſs, in making the perſon hanged on a tree to defile the whole Land, in caſe hee was not buried before Sun-ſet. The whole land was never defiled by any one ceremonial ſin.

I grant that he, or any other might bee deceived in their judgement, by following the tranſlation of *Deut.*21.23. according to the corrupt Edition, as I have ſhewed before, but the right tranſlation, as it was in the firſt Editions, will not afford any ſuch Tenent, if the Context be well weighed.

2 I grant that a great part of the people might bee ceremonially defiled; yea at ſometime the greateſt part, but not by any one tranſgreſſion of the Ceremonial Law, but by ſundry kinds of Ceremonial ſins, as *Ainſ.* ſheweth in *Num.* 9.12.

3 Suppoſe it could be proved (which cannot be) that the whole land might be ceremonially defiled by ſome one perſon, or by ſome one act, then I hope it will alſo follow by a neceſſary conſequence, that God had ordained and provided ſome inſtituted way for the ceremonial cleanſing of the whole land, as well as for particular perſons and places; for doubtleſſe God would not bee wanting in ſome inſtituted way of cleanſing for all ſorts of ceremonial defilements.

But I cannot find any ſuch inſtituted Ordinance for the cleanſing of the whole land for any one ceremonial defilement; neither can I find any one ceremonial defilement greater than that which happened by the touch of a dead perſon, for hee that touched a dead perſon, though hee dyed in his bed, yea though hee were truly godly in his life time, was as much defiled by the ceremonial Law, as he that touched the moſt notorious Malefactor after he was hanged on a tree; and he that touched any dead perſon in the day time, was as much defiled by the ſentence of the Ceremonial Law, as hee that touched a dead Malefactor in the night time after Sun-ſet, and hee that touched but the limb of a dead child, was as much defiled, as he that touched a whole dead child, all that touched the dead, though never ſo many, were all alike defiled in the higheſt degree of ceremonial uncleanneſs, untill they had cleanſed

cleanſed themſelves according to the inſtituted way of cleanſing in *Num.*19.11,15,16. &c.

It is a vain conceit to think that the whole land might be defiled ceremonially by permitting the perſon hanged, to hang on the tree after Sun-ſet, the whole land could not be defiled thereby, unleſs every perſon in the land, did come one by one to touch his dead carkaſs, which is abſurd to think they would do, and yet it muſt be done, in caſe Mr. *Norton* do prove that the whole land was defiled by the Malefactors carkaſs unburied after Sun-ſet; And by this it appears that his knowledge in the Ceremonial Laws, is very ſhort of what it ought to be, or elſe he would never have broached this fiction.

8 It is evident that the hanging of a Malefactor on a tree after Sun-ſet, did not defile the land ceremonially (ſee alſo *n.*2.) for *David*, according to the deſire of the *Gibeonites*, which was ordered, doubtleſs, according to Gods ſpecial poſitive direction, commanded that ſeven of *Sauls* ſons ſhould be given to them to be hanged on a tree, and to continue hanging ſo long as until God ſhould manifeſt himſelf to be attoned and reconciled to the Land, by ſending rain to remove the preſent famine, for there was a famine in the dayes of *David* three years together; *And* David *inquired of the Lord, and the Lord anſwered, It is for* Saul, *and for his bloody houſe, becauſe he ſlew the* Gibeonites, 2 *Sam.* 21.1. therefore *David* ſaid to the *Gibeonites*, in verſe 3. *What ſhall I do for you, and wherewith ſhall I make the Attonement, that ye may bleſs the inheritance of the Lord*; They anſwered to the King in verſe 5. (doubtleſs by ſome ſpecial voluntary poſitive command from God) *Let ſeven of his ſons be delivered to us, and we will hang them up unto the Lord*, namely, to appeaſe the Lords wrath (that was ſo juſtly provoked by *Sauls* ſin againſt the whole land) for *Saul* was the Repreſentative of the whole land, and therefore he ought to have protected, and not killed the innocent *Gibeonites*, as he had done out of his furious zeal, by which notorious moral ſin of his, he defiled the whole land; But by the hanging of his ſeven ſons on a tree for many dayes together, the land was cleanſed from the guilt of *Sauls* moral ſin, and not defiled ceremonially; if it had been defiled ceremonially by their hanging on the tree after Sun-ſet, then doubtleſs it would have

have been recorded in what manner the Land was cleansed again, but no such cleansing is recorded, therefore no such ceremonial defilement did fall upon the land by their hanging many days after sun-set.

I grant that this act of Justice in hanging seven of *Sauls* sons, for his sin, was done by Gods special direction, and by his supreme positive command, and not by the written Law of God, for no personal crimes were laid to the charge of these seven sons of *Saul*, by the Judicial Laws of *Moses*, and therefore except some crime against the Law of *Moses* had been legally proved against them, they could not by the justice of *Moses* revealed Laws have been put to death, much less could they have been hanged on seven trees for their fathers sin, whereof they might be innocent.

Conclusion.

2 Hence it doth necessarily follow, That God hath not revealed in the Scriptures all the rules of his Relative Justice, but he doth still keep a power of Relative Justice in his own hands, according to the counsel of his own Will, as is is evident by this act of Gods special Justice done upon the seven sons of *Saul*, that happily were innocent in the point of *Sauls* furious slaughter of the *Gibeonites*.

The rule of Gods Relative Justice is, his secret will, as well as his revealed will. See cha. 2. at Reply to the 5. Prop. and in *P. Mar.* on Rom. p. 251. and see *Rutherford* on the Covenant p. 26, &c.

Doubtless God gave some special supreme voluntary positive command both to *David* and to the *Gibeonites* touching the hanging of the seven sons of *Saul*; and after the same manner he gave a special positive command to *Abraham* to kill his Son for a Sacrifice, or else it had been an extream wickedness and grosse disobedience to Gods moral Law, to kill his Son; and the like wickedness it would have been in *David* and in the *Gibeonites* to hang up these seven Sons of *Saul*, without a special positive command from God.

I shall not with some (*saith Mr. Rutherford*, in *Christs dying* p. 139. at Asser. 3.) affirm that (which in the general is true) a will contrary to Gods revealed command and will, called *voluntas signi* (which is our moral rule to oblige us) is a sin; but a will contrary to Gods decree, called *voluntas bene placiti*, which is not our Rule obliging (except the Lord be pleased to

impose it on us as a moral Law) is a sin.

Secondly, Hence it follows, that the Law of burying the person hanged the same day, was in relation to the ordinary course of Justice.

Thirdly, Hence it follows, that in some extraordinary cases the supreme Judges had power to increase the length of time in hanging on a tree; As for example, *David* commanded that the hands and feet of *Rechab* and *Banah* should be hanged up for many daies together, now by the Levitical Law every member of a dead body did defile as much as the whole body, See *Ainsw.* in *Numb.*19.11. And therefore *David* knew that their hanging many days on a tree, would not defile the land ceremonially, but that it would cleanse it from their morall defilement, 2 *Sam.*4.11,12. See also our larger Annotations on ver.12.

From these sundry considerations it is evident, That Mr. *Nortons* typical sense of *Deut.*21.23, on which he doth build all his Arguments, doth fail him, and therefore all his Arguments do prove no better but groundless falacies; or to use his own language, he doth but put an abominable inference upon the Apostles, and upon the Spirit of God speaking by him.

The sum of what I have said in the two former Sections, may be drawn up into this Argument.

That Act of Justice which doth cleanse the Land from morall defilements, cannot be said to defile the Land ceremonially.

But the hanging of malefactors on a tree by an act of Justice, till after sun-set, doth cleanse the land.

Therefore, that act of Justice in letting such malefactors hang till after sun-set, doth not defile the Land ceremonially.

SECT. III.

BUt Mr. *Norton* doth still labor to prove, that the curse of hanging on a tree did typifie, that Christ did bear the moral curse on the cross for our redemption.

For

For faith he in p. 95.

There were malefactors hanged before the giving of this Law of Deut.21.23. *Yet we read not that they were accurſed, during the ſpace between the giving of this Law, and the paſſion of Chriſt, a malefactor hanged out of* Judea *was not accurſed; In* Judea *no perſon how great a malefactor ſoever, if not hanged, was thus accurſed. The perſon hanged was equally accurſed, whether he was hanged alive or dead, whether he was hanged after this manner or after that, Jewiſh or Roman; whether his crime were more hainous or not ſo hainous; yea, for ought appeareth, though he were innocent, yet if hanged judicially, he was accurſed, ſince the paſſion of Chriſt, hanging in* Judea *is not ceremonially accurſed.*

Reply 8. Some of theſe unſound notions I find in *Weams* third Volume on *Dan.*21. and alſo in his four Degenerations, 327. where he pleads, to little purpoſe, for the typical ſenſe as Mr. *Norton* doth: But from all Mr. *Nortons* imaginary notions heaped up together, what is the inference, but this? That the curſe in *Deut.*21.23. did typifie that Chriſt was to redeem us from the curſe of the Law, by bearing the moral curſe in our ſtead on the croſs.

But I have ſufficiently ſhewed already that this inference is builded but upon falſe premiſes, and therefore all the Arguments uſed to prove it do vaniſh to nothing.

Secondly, But if his inference had been no more but this, That therefore the Law in *Deut.* 21.23. was peculiar to the Commonwealth of the Jews (and not common to other Nations) it might have been granted to him. And the like may be ſaid of divers other political Laws of *Moſes*, that they were in force onely in the land of *Canaan*, and that neither before *Moſes* time, nor after Chriſts death, they were in force, *&c.* I grant alſo that there were many Judicial Laws that were partly civil and partly ceremonial, and ſo it may be granted that the Law in *Deut.*21.23. had ſome ceremonial conſiderations about the burial of the dead body, for it defiled all that touched it. But yet it will not thence follow, that it defiled the whole land, in caſe it

continued unburied till after sun-set, and therefore it did not typifie that Christ should bear the moral and eternal curse on the tree for our redemption, which is the very point that Mr. *Norton* hath undertaken to make good from *Deut.*21.23.

This Exposition (saith Mr.*Norton* in p. 95,96.) *in making the man that was hanged on a tree, a ceremonial curse. And Christ hanged on a tree a moral curse; is both generally received, and every way agreeing to the analogy of Faith, which is a rule of interpreting Scripture.*

Reply 9. It is not so generally received as Mr.*Norton* would perswade his Reader, it is well enough known that there were and are many godly and judicious ones, that dare not hold that Christ suffered the moral and eternal curse for our redemption.

First, I doe not finde that *Peter Martyr* held that Christ suffered Hell torments, or the second death.

In Rom.9.1,2. in p.240. It is objected, saith *Peter Martyr*, that Christ for our sake did not onely give his life upon the cross, but also that he was made a curse, and was also after a sort forsaken of the Father, when he cryed, *My God, my God why hast thou forsaken mee?*

And after a short Answer to another Objection; he Answers thus,

The second doubt (saith he) is concerning Christ; for although he for our sakes suffered death, yet was he not in very deed separated from God, but his humanity was holpen when he suffered on the cross all extream pains; he was also made a curse as touching the punishment of the Law, which punishment he suffered for our salvation sake, and he was counted as a blasphemer, &c. and being as it were convicted of these crimes, he was condemned. But yet was he not by eternal damnation separated from God.

In this Answer *Peter Martyr* hath left his judgement upon record how Christ was forsaken on the cross, and how he was made a curse by hanging on the tree; he was made a curse, saith he, as touching the punishment of the Law, in *Deut.*21.23. and, saith he, he was counted as a Blasphemer, and an ungodly person,

perſon; and being, as it were, convicted of theſe crimes, he was condemned, but yet was he not by eternal damnation, (namely, by ſuffering that, which to the creature is eternal damnation) ſeparated from God.

By this anſwer it is evident, That he held that Chriſt ſuffered no other curſe but the outward curſe of hanging on a tree, juſt as *Chriſoſtom* and *Theophilact* ſpake, as I have cited them in the former Chap. in 2 *Cor.* 5. 21.

Mr. *Norton* ſaid, ere while, that his expoſition was generally received, but here he may ſee two of the antient Divines, and *Peter Martyr* cited againſt him, and *Peter Martyrs* Anſwer is to an Objection that was raiſed from ſuch as held as Mr. *Norton* doth.

Fourthly, *Bucer* makes Chriſt to ſuffer no other (penal hel or) *infernum*, but his bodily death, as I have cited him in Chap. 7. Sect. 2.

Fifthly, I have alſo diligently peruſed all *Tindals* works, and the works of *Jo. Frith*, and of Dr. *Barns*, being three godly Martyrs, and they do all oppoſe the popiſh ſatisfaction, and by occaſion thereof, they ſpeak often of the true ſatisfaction that was made by Chriſt, and I find not a word in any of them that concurs with Mr. *Nortons* ſenſe of Hell torments, but with the Dialogue ſenſe of ſatisfaction by his bodily death and ſacrifice.

Sixthly, I find that others do cite *Bullenger* and *Zanchy* as not cleaving to Mr. *Nortons* Tenent of Hell Torments. But I have not throughly ſearched them, but in a great part I have, and can find no ſuch thing in them; Let them that pleaſe ſearch them fully.

Seventhly, Mr. *Broughton* and his followers, which to this day are many, that are both pious and learned; and they do reject the Tenent of Hell Torments on the croſs, as no Article of their faith.

I will cite onely two paſſages out of Mr. *Broughton*, beſides what I have cited in the Dialogue.

1 (Saith he) That aſſertion, that our Lord ſuffered Hell Torments, appeareth not true by any Scripture; true modeſty (ſaith he) would look to Scripture phraſes in the handling of our redemption. In his poſitions on *Hades* p. 13.

In his short Reply to *Bilson* p. 22,25.

2 (Saith he) to say that our Lords soul tasted the second death, is the highest degree of blasphemy against our Lord, and (saith he) in p.25. The term second death used twice in the *Apocalips*, is taken from the Thalmudistes, and therefore by them it must be expounded: And in their sense (saith he) it is ever taken for *a misery to the Soul in the perpetual hatred of God*; and agreeable to this, I have shewed in chapter 5. that Hell Torments and the second Death is always inflicted from the hatred of God. *Onkelos* hath it in *Deut.*33. and *Jonathan* in *Isa.*22. and Rabbins infinitely.

The second death is a misery to the soul in the perpetual hatred of God.

But saith Mr. *Norton* (to avoid manifest blasphemy) *Christ was never in Gods hatred.*

Therefore he might as well conclude, that he never suffered the essential torments of Hell, nor the second Death, seeing they are not inflicted without Gods hatred. And saith *Bro.* in *Revel.*p.301. N. N. missed most Atheanly, more than ever any since the Devil deceived *Adam*, to say that our Lord was in the second Death.

2 Mr. *Ainsworth* on *Deut.*33.6. saith, the Chalde doth thus expound it, *Let* Ruben *not die the second death.* And saith he, *Jonathan* in his Targum paraphraseth thus, *Let* Ruben *live in this world and not die with the death wherewith the wicked shall dye in the world to come.* And saith he in *Psal.*49.11. The Chalde saith, *That wicked wise men die the second death, and are adjudged to Gehenna.* And saith he in his preface to *Genisis* p.6. The second death in *Rev.* 20.8. is used by *Jonathan* in *Isa.*65.6.15. and saith he in *Gen.*17.14. *Mamony* in Treat. of Repentance, c.8. Sect.1. Speaking of eternal death saith, And this is the cutting off written in the Law, as it is said (in *Numb.*15.31.) *That soul shall be cut off, he shall be cut off*; which we have heard expounded thus, cut off in this world, and cut off in the world to come.

3 Dr. *Hammon* in his Annotation on *Rev.*20.6. saith, this phrase, the second Death is four times used in this book, and it seems to be taken from the Jews, who use it proverbially, for finall, utter, irreversible destruction. So in the *Jerusalim* Targum, *Deut.*33.6. Let *Ruben* live, and let him not dye the second death, by which the wicked dye in the world to come.

4 Mr.

4 Mr. *Broughton* ſaith, That the ancient godly Hebrew Doctors that lived after *Ezra*, ſeeing the increaſe of Sadducees, they did frame divers terms to expreſs the world to come, both in relation to the godly, and to the wicked Epicurean Sadducees, and thoſe terms in their ſenſe doth the New Teſtament approve, and follow; and they made the term, Second-death, to expreſs the immortal miſery that belongs to the ſoul of the wicked in the world to come, they made the ſpiritual death of the ſoul by original ſin, and the death of the body, to be the death of this world: And *Auſtin* ſpeaks juſt as the Dialogue doth (as I have cited him in Chap. 16. Reply 20.) That the ſpiritual death of ſin, and the death of the body is the First-death, becauſe it belongs to all men in this world; and ſo doth *Zanchy* in his Sermons, page 162. and that the Second-death belongs only to the wicked after this life is ended. But Mr. *Norton* oppoſeth this diviſion of death in page 115. and page 120. and makes a threefold death to confound the Reader about the term Second-death in *Rev.* 14. and ſo hee evades his anſwer, to the main ſcope of the Dialogues Argument (againſt Chriſts ſuffering of the Second-death) which is this, namely, That the Second-death cannot be ſuffered in this life, where the First-death only is ſuffered by Gods appointment. But on the contrary, he labours to maintain that Chriſt ſuffered the Second-death in this world, by Gods extraordinary diſpenſation. But I have formerly anſwered that the Papiſts may in like ſort maintain the Miracles that they aſcribe to their legion of Saints, if they may but flye to Gods extraordinary diſpenſation.

In his Reduct. on Dan 9.

All ſorts of death that men do ſuffer in this world, is counted but the firſt, in relation to the Second death in the world to come.

8 Mr. *Anthony Wotton* denied Mr. *Nortons* Tenent, though for ſome reſpects beſt known to himſelf, he was ſparing to publiſh his judgement; and yet he hath left enough in print to witneſs what I ſay; and it is alſo further evident in this, that hee denied that God imputed our ſins to Chriſt as the meritorious cauſe of his ſufferings, as I have ſhewed in the former Chapter.

De Reconc. par. 2. l. 1. c. 11. n. 8. and more clearly in c. 18. n. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12.

9 I find by conference with ſuch as have been wel read in the Ancient Divines, that nothing in them without wreſting their ſenſe, can be found that doth evidence, that they held that God did

did legally impute our sins to Christ, as the meritorious cause of inflicting Hell-torments on him.

10 The Dialogue hath cited some eminent Divines both for Learning and Piety, that have denied that Christ suffered Hell-torments (like the two witnesses of Gods truth) even when that doctrine bare the greatest sway, as Mr. *Robert Smith* that suffered much for the truth, being silenced through the iniquity of the times, and Mr. *Robert Wilmot*, a man eminent for learning and the power of godliness, and Mr. *Christopher Carlisle*, a judicious Expositor, and Mr. *Nichols* a student of the Inner-Temple. All which were far from siding with Popish Tenents, as some (to blast the truth) are apt to say, that scarce any deny Christs suffering of Gods vindicative wrath, but Papists.

11 I have on *Psal.*22.1. cited our larger Annotation, that goes quite contrary to Mr. *Nortons* strain.

12 I have cited other eminent Divines in Chap.2.Sect.2. that do hold much differing from Mr. *Norton*.

And it is a known thing among the Learned, that *sub judice lis est*, It is a controversie not yet unanimously resolved, and therefore I presume, I shall meet with some judicious Readers that will be able to judge, whether the Dialogue, and the truth therein contained, hath been rightly censured by Mr. *Norton*, and by those that set him on work.

This Proposition (saith Mr. *Norton*) in page 96. *Cursed is every one that hangs on a Tree: is a typical Proposition, and contains in it these two truths:*

1 *That every one that hangeth upon a Tree in* Judea, *from the promulgation of that Curse, to the Passion of Christ inclusively, is ceremonially accursed, i.e. All that are hanged are so infamed, that the carkass of such, in case they be not buried before Sun-set, shall defile the land.*

2 *That Christ in testimony that he redeemed us by bearing the moral curse, should be hanged on a Tree.*

Reply 10. Neither of the two Propositions are true in themselves, much lesse are they deducible from the Text in *Deut.*21.23.

11

1 I have ſufficiently ſhewed already, That this exhortation, defile not the land, is not connexed, but ſeparated from the former ſentence by a colon, or by a full prick as the *Geneva* and *Tindal* make it, and that it hath reference to the execution and exact juſtice upon Malefactors, as in verſe 21.22.

2. That no Ceremonial ſin did defile the whole land.

3 That hanging on a Tree longer than Sun-ſet, did not defile the land; and that ſometimes hanging many dayes together, did not defile, but cleanſe the land from moral ſins.

4 Therefore ſeeing all Mr. *Nortons* Arguments laid together, have not ſtrength enough to prove his firſt typical expoſition of *Deut.* 21. 23. much leſſe have they ſtrength ſufficient to prove his ſecond Propoſition, which cannot bee true, unleſs the firſt be true.

But yet Mr. *Norton* makes a great ſhew for his expoſition, by citing *Junius*, *Piſcator*, *Parker*, and Mr. *Ainſworth*; as concurring with his ſenſe, therefore I will make a ſhort Reply.

Reply 11. The two firſt (I perceive by conference with ſuch as have peruſed them) ſpeak very moderately and ſparingly, and not ſo full as Mr. *Norton* doth; but ſuppoſe they were fully of his mind, yet that could not prove no more but this, That Mr. *Norton* is not alone in his expoſition and collections, and ſo much may the Dialogue ſay; but all that are judicious do know, that it is not mans conſent, but Scripture rightly interpreted, and Arguments drawn from a right interpretation that muſt determine the point.

3 I have not yet examined what Mr. *Parker* ſaith.

4 As for Mr. *Ainſworth*, he is a little too bold to make him full of his judgement; let his mind and meaning be examined by conferring with his own words in his Annotations in *Gen.* 3.15. in *Num.* 21.9. in *Exod.*32.32. in *Lev.*6. 21. in *Pſal.*69.4. Beſides, I received ſome letters from him in his life-time about this controverſie, whereby I know that his judgement was not throughly eſtabliſhed one way or other; and I know by ſome expreſſions of his, that he could not hold that Chriſt ſuffered

Hell-torments, though he did hold that Christ suffered the wrath of God in some degree; and I find that other learned Divines do hold as he did, namely, That Christ suffered the wrath of God in some degree, and yet they deny that he suffered Hell-torments, and the Second-death, which is also directly contrary to Mr. *Nortons* fundamentals; for hee holds just satisfaction by a just suffering of the essential Curse of Hell-torments.

Dr. *Preston* saith, That the curse of God doth consist in four things.

In his Treatise of Love, p. 176.

1 When God doth separate a man from grace, goodness, and holiness.

2 When he is separated from the presence of the Lord; from the joy, from the influence, and from the protection of God.

3 When he is cursed in outward things.

4 When he shall suffer the eternal curse at the day of judgement.

But now was Christ thus cursed of God?

Methinks it should make a godly man tremble to say so, and yet Mr. *Norton* approves of *Luther* for saying so in page 92, 93. who durst alledge this place, saith *Luther*, *Accursed is every one that hangs on a Tree, and apply it to Christ.* Like as *Paul* then applied this sentence to Christ, even so, may we apply unto Christ not only the whole 27. Chapter of *Deuteronomy*, but also may gather up all the Curses of *Moses* Law together, and expound the same of Christ; for as Christ is innocent in this general Law touching his person, so is he also in all the rest; and as he is guilty in this general Law, in that he is made a curse for us, and hanged upon the Cross as a wicked man, a blasphemer, a murderer, and a traitor, even so is he guilty also in all others; for all the Curses of the Law, are heaped together, and laid upon him.

Hence it follows from *Luthers* words, approved by Mr. *Norton*, that the said Curses mentioned by Dr. *Preston*, were laid upon Christ; or else Mr. *Norton* must not approve of this speech of *Luther*.

In Christs dying, p. 560, 561.

Mr. *Rutherford* propounds this Question; How could Christ be a Curse? There is (saith he) a thing intrinsecally and fun-

fundamentally curſed, and there is a thing extrinſecally and effectively curſed: Now (ſaith he) none but he that ſinneth, is intrinſecally and fundamentally curſed; for in this regard, it is a perſonal evil, Chriſt was not intrinſecally abominable, and execrable to God, *&c.*

This diſtinction of extrinſecally and effectively curſed, was contrived only for the ſake of Chriſt, or elſe doubtleſs, hee would have given ſome other inſtance of his aſſertion.

I grant, That Mr. *Rutherfurd* did hold that Chriſt did ſuffer the moral Curſe, as Mr. *Norton* doth; But yet he held it arbytrary to the Lawgiver to execute the curſe on Chriſt, rather in the equivalency than in the proper kind of it; and therefore he ſaith, That ſome puniſhments may well bee changed, the one for the other, as Gods hating and abominating the ſinner, was changed into Gods forſaking of Chriſt, when he complained, *My God, my God, &c.*

And ſecondly, ſaith he, Chriſt was not intrinſecally curſed as the ſinner who ſinneth in perſon is; and then he concludes, that the kind of puniſhment which Chriſt ſuffered, was arbytrary to the Lawgiver.

But Mr. *Norton* denies it to be arbytrary, for ſaith he, in page 10. The Omnipotent had ſo limited himſelf by his Law in *Gen.*2.17. that he could not alter; and ſaith hee in page 146.143. though in many typical redemptions, God accepted a price, and ſpared life, yet not ſo in the Antitype; No price (ſaith he) can diſpence in the caſe of the Antitype: And ſaith he, in page 122. Chriſt was tormented without any forgiveneſs, God ſpared him nothing of the due debt, he had not the leaſt drop of water to eaſe him of the leaſt particle of ſuffering that was due according to juſtice: And ſaith he, in page 23. he ſuffered the whole, eſſential, properly penal death of the Curſe, that is, the whole eſſential puniſhment thereof, was executed upon Chriſt.

Mr. *Norton* holds ſatisfaction by Chriſts ſuffering the eſſential curſe in kind, and yet he holds alteration to equivalency.

By theſe fundamental Propoſitions, he muſt reject any alteration to the way of equivalency; and yet he is ſometimes forced to flye to equivalency, as I have noted it in Chap.4.

I confeſs, I cannot but wonder that Mr. *Norton* doth keep no more exactly to his principles of payment in kind, but that he is forced to flye ſometimes to equivalency.

The reſt that follows in Mr. *Norton* on *Gal.*3.13. is but the ſame in true ſubſtance that hath already been examined, and confounded: And that which follows about the Prieſt-hood, and Sacrifice of Chriſt, I have examined at the end of my Examination of *Pſal.*22.1. and *Mat.*27.46.

CHAP. XVI.

SECT. 1.

Mr. *Norton* propounds this Queſtion, in p. 56.

How do you prove this ſorrow and complaint (of Chriſt) to have proceeded from the fear of a bodily death?

Reply 1. THe Dialogue doth prove it by two Reaſons. First, Saith the Dialogue, do but conſider what a horrid thing, to true humane nature, the death of the body is, and then conſider that Chriſt had a true humane nature, like to all other men, except in the point of ſin, and therefore why ſhould not he be troubled with the fear of death, as much as his humane nature could bear, without ſin?

Mr. *Norton* doth Anſwer thus,

Becauſe regular affections, ſuch as Chriſts were, moved according to the nature of the object, ſo much therefore as bodily death is a leſs evil than eternal death, ſo much the regular trouble of humane nature conflicting therewithall, is leſs than that trouble which it is capable of ſuffering, in caſe of conflicting with eternal death.

Reply 2. He ſaith, That Chriſt conflicted with eternal death, and that the regular trouble of his humane nature, was in relation to that death: They may beleeve his bare word that pleaſe; and

and he knows that the Dialogue doth all along deny it, and I have also taken away his proof in other places; therefore the reason of the Dialogue doth stand good and firm still.

The second Reason of the Dialogue is this,

Do but consider that all mankind ought to desire and endeavor to preserve their natural lives as much as in them lies, in the use of means, in obedience to the first command, and therefore seeing Christ, as he was true man, could not prevent his death by the use of means, he was bound to be troubled with the fear of death, as much as any other man.

Mr. *Norton* in p.57. doth answer thus.

It is more than manifest that his trouble exceeded the trouble of any other man, as concerning meer natural death.

Christ did fear death regularly more than other men can do, because his pure nature was not subject to death as ours is. In his War & Peace, ch.36. and I have cited Mr. *Ball* to this sense in ch. 17. at Reply 25. Christ both in his combate with Satan, & also in the formality of his death, by his Priestly order, did all by way of Covenant, and not by condition of nature.

Reply 3. It is more then manifest that he was to be troubled with the fear of a bodily death more than any other man, because the constitution of his nature and natural spirits, was more pure than the nature of other men, and therefore he must manifestly abhor it more than other men, for he was not made subject to death by nature as all other men are; all other men by reason of original sin are born the bondslaves of Satan, Death is their Birth-right, and therefore they abhorre it not in a regular manner, but with a dull slavish spirit, but because Christs nature was conceived by the Holy Ghost without original sin, therefore he was not born the bondslave of death. Death hath no right (saith *Peter Martyr* in *Rom.* p. 121.) where there is no sin, unless we will say that God doth punish the innocent, and hence it follows, that the pure constitution of his nature must needs be troubled with the regular fear of his bodily death, more than other men can be.

His death saith *Grotius* was not determined by any Law (as Mr. *Norton* affirms) but by agreement, and as it were by special Covenant made with his Father, who upon that condition promised him not onely the highest glory, but a seed to serve him for ever. This speech of *Grotius* is worth our marking. And in ch.2. I have shewed more at large that the death of Christ

was a death of Covenant, and not of condition of nature, as ours is. And in relation to his Covenant, and to the rich reward of his death by Gods Covenant, his rational soul did always desire to die, but yet that desire did no way hinder his natural and vital soul from fearing the ill usage of his pure nature by Satan and his instruments.

See Mr. *Burges* on Just. p 81. & Dr. *Williams* in his seven Golden Candlesticks, p 483.

Secondly, I find this to be a received maxim among the learned, that the bodily pains which Christ indured, were more sensible to his nature, than the like paints can be to other men, because of the most excellent temper, and tender Constitution of his body, and therefore his vital and sensitive soul (which is the bond of union between the immortal soul and the body) was quicker in operation than other mens spirits can be, with the dread and fear of his ignominious death.

Heb.10.5. The excellent temper, and tender constitution of Christs humane nature made him more sensible of fear, shame, and pain, than other men can be.

That speech of our Saviour is emphatical, in *Heb.*10.5. *A body hast thou prepared me*, namely, by sending the Holy Ghost to prepare the seed of the woman for my humane nature, that it may be of a more excellent temper, and tender constitution than any other mans can be, and therefore that it may be touched with the objects of fear, ignominy, and pain more eminently than other mens can be: and therefore as it behoved God to prepare such a body on purpose for him; so it behoved Christ to be made like unto his brethren, and to be touched in an eminent manner with the sence of our passions and infirmities, that he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest, and so in particular he must be eminently touched with the fears of death, *Heb.*2.14.17.

And so it became God the Father to consecrate the Prince of our salvation through sufferings, and how else did it become God to consecrate him, but by making his obedience perfect through sufferings; and therefore said Christ to God, *A body hast thou prepared me*, thou hast moulded it, and organized it on purpose to be touched with the tender sense and feeling of mans infirmities in my sensitive soul, the better to exemplifie the perfection of my patience, and obedience through all my sufferings; It is no marvel then, that seeing the constitution of his body and spirits, was thus transcendently tender, that his soul-troubles are expressed by all the Evangelists, to be more than

than other mens can be, as concerning their meer bodily sufferings and death.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 57.

Other men conflicting with death by reason of sin, do not conflict only with death, other men conflicting with natural death, conflict also often with eternal death, Christ according to you conflicted only with a natural death; how then do you say without any distinction, that he was bound to be troubled with the fear of death as much as any other man?

Reply 4. I reply to the Interrogation that Christs troubled fear of death was wholly Regular, but other mens fear, is for the most part irregular; Christs fear therefore must not bee compared to this, or that particular mans fear, as Mr. *Nortons* kind of arguing doth impore to the lesse wary Reader; but his fear must be considered in relation to that disease of evil which was opposite to the perfection of his nature; for by the rule of Gods Creation, *Adam* and *Christ* were perfect in nature, and not subject to curses, and therefore according to the Rule of Contraries, the more ignominy and pains of death they must suffer, the more they must abhor it more than other men that are the slaves of death by nature; the soul and body in the first creation, were united in all perfection after Gods Image, and therefore all ignominy, torments, and death must needs be an abhorring in an higher degree than it can be to other men, and therefore it was most suitable to Christs regular constitution to manifest his exceeding troubled fear of his ignominious, and painful lingring death, more than any other man can do in a regular manner.

Christ feared his ignominious death after the rule of fear, & not after the example of this or that man.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 57.

Christ according to you conflicted only with a natural death, and he doth very often charge the Dialogue with this expression of a natural death, as in page 156,158,159,164,&c.

Reply 5.

Christs death was not a natural death.

Reply 5. This I beleeve is a false charge; I do not remember that the Dialogue doth any where call the death of Christ a natural death; but it doth carefully shun that term, as altogether unfit, because the death of Christ was supernatural. The Dialogue holds that Christ was not subject to a natural death, as sinners are from the curse of original sin in *Gen.*3.19. as I have shewed a little before, and shall do it again towards the end of this Chapter.

Secondly, But yet the Dialogue doth often call the death of Christ a true bodily death (in opposition to Mr. *Nortons* spiritual death) with this explanation, that his death was such a kind of bodily death, that it was also a mediatorial death and sacrifice.

If Mr. *Norton* had not been more than ordinary blinded with prejudice against the Dialogue, he could not so often have mistaken the words and sense of the Dialogue, as I have noted it also elsewhere, yea in page 153. he saith, That Christ suffered not only a natural, but a spiritual death.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 57.

Christs meer inability as man, to prevent death by the use of means, or other mens inability thereto, and that at such times when they were not wanting on their part; neither was it their duty to endeavour continuance of life, but on the contrary, to give up themselves to death, such as was the present case of Christ, and was long before the case of Isaak, *and sometimes hath been the case of Martyrs, who notwithstanding have given up their lives with joy, cannot be looked at as a reason of his, or their being bound to be so troubled with the fear of death.*

Reply 6. I shall speak the briefer to this inference, because I have already shewed in *Reply* 3. That the humane nature of Christ was priviledged from death, and from the fear of death, and from all other miseries by nature; But yet such was his infinite and eternal love to the Elect that were fallen in *Adam*, that according to the Council of the Trinity, he entred into a Covenant

venant with his Father, to take upon him the seed of the deceived woman, with our infirmities, and to enter the Lists, and to combate with Satan that had a Commission given him to peirce him in the foot-soals, with an ignominious death, and therefore he covenanted to manifest the truth of his humane nature, in fearing and abhorring such a kind of usage for the salvation sake of all the Elect: And saith *Rutherford* on the Covenant, page 342. God by a permissive decree, appointed the crucifying of the Lord of life, but as touching his approving and commanding will, he did neither will the crucifying of his Son, but forbids, and hates it as execrable murther.

1 Then consider Christs troubled natural fear of death materially, with all the circumstances of ignominy and tortores from the Devil and his Instruments, according to Gods declared permission in *Gen.*3.15. and then it was his duty to stir up his sensitive soul to be tenderly, and eminently touched with a trembling fear, and with a manifest abhorring of this kind of usage.

2 But consider his ignominious and painful death formally, namely, with the reward that was annexed to it by Gods Covenant, which was that he should thereby merit the salvation of all the Elect; and then I say, It was the duty of his rational soul not to fear, but earnestly to desire to perform this combate with Satan, and to suffer him to do his worst; and therefore in this regard, he said, I *delight to do thy will, O God, thy Law is in my heart*, Heb. 10. And I desire to eat this Passover, this Type of my death, before I suffer.

3 Christs humane nature knew perfectly by the revealed will of God, in *Gen.*3.15. that God had armed the Devil against him, with an express permission to use him as a sinful Malefactor, and to peirce him in the foot-soals, and in this combate, hee knew it was the declared will of God, that hee should encounter him (not with the power of his God-head, but) with his humane nature only, as it was accompanied with our infirmities, of fear, sorrow, &c. and therefore by his Covenant hee was bound to express and manifest his troubled natural fear of such an unnatural usage, and accordingly he declared it to his three Apostles that he took with him to be witnesses, that he did

then begin to be sorrowful, and very heavy, saying unto them,
Mat.26.38,39. *My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even to the death.* Mat.26,37,38,39. and then he went a little further from them, and fel on his face, and prayed, saying, *O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me*; and this request he made three times over, because it was of absolute necessity that that cup should pass from him, namely, the cup of his natural fear.

I have shewed in the Dialogue, page 46. that the word Cup, is put for a measure, or portion of any thing, either of joy and comfort, or of ignominy and pain, or of fear and sorrow, and at this time he was very heavy and sorrowful; and therefore the cup that he doth so earnestly deprecate, is the cup, or measure, or portion of his present natural fear.

Hee doth not in this place (as I apprehend) deprecate his ignominious and painful death, but the fear and dread which his sensitive soul had of it at this present, and he was heard and delivered from his natural fear, or else hee could not have laid down his life by his own will, desire and power, as hee had covenanted, *Joh.*10.17,18. But as soon as hee had obtained a confirmation by his sweating prayers against this his natural fear, then when the band was come to apprehend him, he was fearless, and said unto *Peter*, *Put up thy sword again into its place, for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword*; *thinkest thou*
Mat.26.52,53, 54. *that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more then twelve legions of Angels? But how then shall the Scriptures be fulfilled, that say, Thus it must be*: The Scriptures in *Gen.* 3.15. &c. say, that I must bee thus apprehended, condemned, and executed by the power of Satan and his instruments, *Thus it must be*, I must be thus used, as you shall now see mee to bee by these Arch-instruments of Satan; yea thus it must bee of necessity, even by the necessity of the voluntary Decree and Covenant, and therefore I must bee voluntary also in the performance of this combate, and not admit of any obstruction to my Combatter by thy sword, he must by Gods declared permission, have his liberty to do his worst to provoke my patience, and I must do my duty by continuing constant in my obedi-
Joh.18.11. ence, through all his assaults: But *John* doth relate our Saviours words to *Peter* thus, *Put up thy sword into thy sheath, the cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?* namely, that

portion

portion of my ignominious and painful sufferings which my Father hath appointed mee to undergo, as hee hath declared it in *Gen.*3.15. Here you see that Christ did not now dread this cup of his ignominious and painful sufferings, as hee did the fear of this cup in *Matth.*26.37. Then it was necessary before he prayed, that his natural infirmities of fear and sorrow should appear, but now it was as necessary after he had obtained his request, that his natural infirmities should not appear; and therefore he said to *Peter, Shall I not drink it?*

4 I have shewed from Mr. *Rutherford* in Chap.2. that Christs desire that the cup might pass from him, was no sin, because the command of God to lay down his life was not a moral command (as Mr. *Norton* unadvisedly doth affirm) for if his death had been required by a moral command, then his desire that the cup might past from him, had been a sin (and then his natural fear of death had been a sin also) but Gods command was a meer positive command, and that kind of command, saith Mr. *Rutherford*, did never root out his natural desire to preserve his own life, seeing hee submitted his desire to Gods will; The like instance hee gives of *Abrahams* desire, when God commanded him to kill his only Son for a sacrifice: And though Mr. *Rutherford* holds that Christ suffered Hell-torments, yet he denies (as the Dialogue doth) that the word Fear in *Heb.*5.7. is to be understood of his fear of Hell-torments; hee expounds it (as the Dialogue doth) on the Covenant, page 362. Heb.5.7.

But still I rather think (as I said before) that Christ did not desire simply at any time to be freed from death, for that had been to desire to be freed from the performance of his Covenant; but only from the cup of his natural fear, & from his present natural distrust of his ignominious usage by his ignominious and painful death; and in this prayer and supplication of his, he was heard and delivered, *Heb.*5.7. and this request was of necessity to be obtained, or else he could not have fulfilled his Covenant, which was, that he would lay down his life by his own free will desire, and power, even by the active power, and joynt concurrence of both his natures, *Joh.*10.17,18. and this command he could not fulfil until he had obtained a confirmation by his earnest prayers in the Garden, against his natural fear of death:

And hence it follows, that seeing Christ could not prevent his decreed death, he was bound by his Covenant to be troubled (at least for a time) with the fear of it, and that *in* a transcendent manner, as much as his humane, tender, natural constitution could bear without sin, namely, until he had by his earnest prayers obtained a confirmation.

De Tribus Elohim, part.2.l.3. c.9. And see *Weems* in his Portraiture, p.191,192.

5 Saith *Zanchy*, as touching Christs divine nature, there was alwayes one and the same will of the Father, and the Son, concerning his death and Passion; yea as Christ was man, hee was alwayes obedient to his Father; and therefore hee said, I alwayes do the things that please him.

What meaning then (saith he) hath this, That he prayed to be freed from death, and from the cup?

He answers: Naturally as man, Christ feared, abhorred, and shunned death, and his natural horror of death he called his *Will*, when he said, *Not my will be done*, to wit, this natural Will which I have as man; yet neither doth this Will of Christ resist his Fathers Will; for the Father would have Christ to bee like us in all things, except sin, and to that end would have him made man; Therefore when Christ did naturally shun and desire to escape death, hee did not contradict his Fathers will, because the Father would have this (natural) fear and horror to bee in Christ as a * punishment of our sins; wherefore it is altogether false that Christs will in this was divers from his Fathers will. But (saith he) if in respect of the same end the Father had been willing that Christ should dye, and Christ had been unwilling, or had never so little refused, then their Wills indeed had been repugnant; but in reference to the same end, namely, our salvation, Christ alwayes had the same will that his Father had.

* So *Weems* in his Portraiture of the Image of God in man p.148. saith Christs Passions were a punishment, but not a sin: And saith, *Weems* in p. 220. Christ had natural fear actually, which the first *Adam* had not, because there was no hurtful object before his eyes, as there was before Christ.

In these words *Zanchy* doth shew that it was absolutely necessary for Christ, in regard of his true humane nature, to bee inwardly touched with the natural fear of his bodily death, and to evidence it outwardly; but he makes no mention that Christ feared his spiritual and eternal death, as Mr. *Norton* doth most unsoundly from the same Text.

But

But saith Mr. *Norton* still in page 57.

It hath oftentimes been the case of Martyrs to give up their lives with joy.

Reply 7. Hence he thinks it was not beseeming for Christ to bee so troubled as he was with the fear of his bodily death: But saith *P. Martyr* in *Rom.* 5.12. All the godly do affirm that in death there is a feeling of the wrath of God, and therefore of its own nature it driveth men into a certain pain and horror, which thing (saith he) both Christ himself when he prayed in the Garden, and many other holy men have declared: And (saith he) if there chance to be any to whom it is pleasant and delectable to dye, and to be rid of their life, that they have elsewhere, and not from the nature of death.

If there be any Martyrs to whom it is pleasant to die that they have from other where, and not from the nature of death.

In these words observe that *P. Martyr* doth make the bodily death of Christ to be the material cause of his pain, and horror in the Garden, quite contrary to Mr. *Norton*, he doth never mention the Second death, and Hell-torments to bee the cause of his horror in the Garden, as Mr. *Norton* doth.

2 Saith hee, If there be any (whether Martyrs or Christ) to whom it is pleasant and delectable to dye, and to be rid of their life, that they have elsewhere, and not from the nature of death.

3 The Dialogue gives good reasons in page 52. why Christ should shew more fear of death then any Martyrs, namely,

First, For the clearer manifestation of the truth of his humane nature.

And secondly, For the accomplishment of the Predictions of his sufferings; and therefore that mercy of his that made him to take our humane nature of the seed of the woman, made him to take our natural infirmities, and to manifest them to the uttermost in seasonable times, as objects did present the occasion.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 69.

You make Christ not only more afraid of natural death than many

Martyrs, but to shew more fear of death than any man; And, saith hee, *Your reasons are but deceptions.*

Reply 8. If Christ had shewed no more natural fear of death than some men do, it might well have been doubted whether hee had been true man or no, seeing sundry Hereticks have called it into question, notwithstanding hee gave such large testimony of it by his exceeding natural fear as hee did.

I find this excellent Observation in our larger Annotations on *Psal.* 22. 1. We further briefly say, That Christ was pleased to yeeld to sense (or feeling) so far,

1 That he might shew himself a perfect true man; a thing not easily beleeved, as appears by the multitude of Heresies about this matter, that sprung up soon after the first plantation of the faith, there being no greater evidence to ordinary judgement at least, of his perfect humanity, than his being subject to the common infirmities of man.

Secondly, To keep us from fainting and despair in the greatest trials, combats, and afflictions, whether spiritual, or corporal, when God seems to forget us.

Aulus Gellius a known ancient Writer, in his 19. book of *Noctes Atticæ*, ch. 1. 12.

And thirdly, As for them that think unpassionateness the greatest evidence of magnanimity, I commend the Disputes of two famous Philosophers recorded by *Aulus Gellius*. Thus far speaks the said Annotation.

When the pains of death have astonished sanctified reason in Martyrs, then no man can express what conflict there is between nature and death which conflict was not in Christ.

Fourthly, this is observable, That though many Martyrs have, through the grace of constancy, undergone the pains of death with joy, or with little sign of their natural fear of death, whiles they have had the use of their sanctified reason, yet afterwards as soon as their torments have astonished nature, and by that means deprived them of the use of their sanctified reason, then the same soul that was so fearless at first, doth begin to shew the terrors of nature at the dominion of death, and then no man can express what conflicts of fear and horror there is in nature against death; but the manner of Christs death was far otherwise, for at the utmost point of death, Christs humane nature did not conflict with fear and horror, as all Martyrs do: But hee expressed his natural fear and horror of death beforehand in the Garden as it were in private to three

of

of his Disciples, that they might record it as a proof of his true humane nature, for he did manifest it,

First, By his speeches before he prayed.

And secondly, in the time of his prayers: but not after his prayers, there was no mention of any more fear: for by his prayers he had obtained a confirmation of his nature against the fear of his ignominious usage, and against the fear of death; I say it once more, that it may be the better marked, that after his prayers, hee never shewed any fear of death more; yea when he was at the very point of death upon the Cross, hee did not express any natural struggling or striving with the pangs of death, for there was no pangs in his death, because the formality of it was supernatural, and therefore his nature was not now subject to strive with the pangs of death, as nature doth in all Martyrs; the formality of his death did far surpass the death of all Martyrs, because he had obtained a deliverance, and a confirmation from his natural fear of death, by his strong crying, prayers, and tears in the Garden, *Heb.5.7.* So that when hee came to breath out his soul in the open view of all men, both of his persecutors, and of his godly friends, he did without Heb.5.7. any trembling or struging of nature, instantly, and quietly, breath out his soul by his own Priestly power, even whiles hee was in strength of nature, and this I hope is contrary to the course of nature in the death of all Martyrs; And by this last act of Christ in his death, he declared himself to be our Mediator in his death, and to be our High-priest in his death and sacrifice.

Lord (saith *Cyprian*) thou didst profess thy self before thine Apostles so be sorrowful unto death, and for exceeding grief, didst powre forth a bloody sweat: But (saith hee) I admire thee, O Lord, that being once fastened to the Cross, amidst the condemned, to be now, neither sorrowful, nor fearful, but despising the punishments, with thy hands lifted up, to triumph over *Amalrick*. Here you see that *Cyprians* judgement was, That Christ was neither sorrowful nor fearful for his death, when he hung upon the Cross, as hee was in the Garden, and therefore hee held that Christ had overcome this fear and horror of death by his prayers in the Garden. *Cyprian de Pass. Christi.*

And secondly, That in the Garden, hee did powre forth:

forth a bloody ſweat, for fear of his bodily death.

Thirdly, Hee held that Chriſt triumphed over *Amalek*, that is to ſay, over Satan, by his unconquerable patience on the Croſs.

Concluſion from the Premiſes.

Hence it follows, that the two reaſons of the Dialogue afore cited, ſtand ſtronger and firmer than they did, notwithſtanding Mr. *Norton* hath endeavoured to ſhake them to nothing by his windy reaſoning.

§ But in Page 58. Mr. *Norton* doth vindicate *Calvin* from the Dialogue ſenſe to his ſenſe.

Reply 9. What the Dialogue cited out of Mr. *Calvin* touching Chriſts troubled fear of death, where his words run without any mention of Hell-torments, was at the firſt uſeful to me, and I thought that the ſame ſpeeches might bee of the like good uſe to others, eſpecially ſeeing the Dialogue doth annex unto the former ſpeeches of *Calvin*, his expreſſions of Chriſts troubled ſoul-ſorrows for the death of *Lazarus* by his weeping and groaning in ſpirit, and troubling himſelf, *Joh.*11.33,35. In which ſoul-troubles ſo pathetically manifeſted, no man can imagine that he ſuffered any thing in ſoul from Gods immediate wrath, or from Hell-torments; and therefore why ſhould we not likewiſe expound his other ſoul-ſorrows to be in relation to his ignominious and painful death?

But ſeeing Mr. *Norton* is not willing to accept his words, as I cited them, to the ſenſe of the Dialogue, let him take Mr. *Calvin* on his ſide; the truth of the Dialogue I hope, may ſtand well enough without him, and in caſe hee ſhall except againſt any other that I have cited for illuſtration, I ſhall not much paſs, as long as I cite the Scripture ſenſe according to the Context.

But for all this, it ſeems that Mr. *Norton* is not very well pleaſed with Mr. *Calvins* judgement; for in page 61. Mr. *Norton* doth cite him on purpoſe to confute him.

Mr. *Calvin* (ſaith hee) doth affirm that Chriſt ſuffered in his

his ſoul the terrible torment of the damned, and forſaken men.

But, ſaith Mr. *Norton*, *becauſe the ſufferings of the damned differ in ſome things from the ſufferings of Chriſt, latter Writers chuſe rather to ſay, That he ſuffered the puniſhment of the Elect, who deſerved to be damned, then that he ſuffered the puniſhment of the damned.*

Reply 10. This diſtinction may pleaſe ſuch as had rather take mans word without the Scripture ſenſe, than take the pains to dig out the true Scripture ſenſe.

But I wonder what difference there is betwixt this ſpeech of *Calvin*, that Chriſt ſuffered in his ſoul the terrible torments of the damned, and forſaken men; and this ſpeech of Mr. *Nortons* in page 56. That Chriſt conflicted with eternal death; and that ſpeech in page 213. That Chriſt was accurſed with a poenal and eternal curſe? For my part, I can find no difference in them, but I will leave ſuch nice diſtinctions to them that love them, and that can diſcern the difference, for I cannot.

SECT. II.

Mr. Nortons *Anſwer in page 62. to the Dialogues Expoſition of* Mark.10.39. *Examined.*

Mar.10.39. Mat.26.39. Mat.10.22,23.

THe words in the Dialogue run thus in page 46. our Saviour doth explain the quality of thoſe ſorrows which hee ſuffered at the time of his death, unto the two ſons of *Zebedeus*, he tells them, *They muſt drink of his cup, and be baptized with his baptiſm*, Mar.10.39. Hee tells them, That they muſt bee conformable to the quality and kind of his ſufferings, though perhaps there might bee ſome difference in the degree of their ſufferings, and he doth explain the kind of his ſufferings by a twofold expreſſion.

1 Hee tells them, *They muſt drink of his cup*, that is to ſay, of the ſame bitter portion of death.

2 Hee tells them, *That they muſt be baptized with his baptiſm*,

that is to say, They must be put to death by the malice of Tyrants, as he must be; and this is expressed by the metaphor of Baptism, for baptizing is a diving or drowning of the whole body under water; and therefore Christ ordained Baptism as a typical sign of drowning the body of sin in his blood; but the baptizing of Tyrants was used for no other end, but to drown mens bodies to death; and in this respect Christ saith, *I am entred into the deep waters*, Psal.69.2,15. and in this very sense the Apostle saith, *Else what shall they do that are baptized for dead* (namely, what shall they do that are baptized with death, as Martyrs are) *if the dead rise not at all, why then are they baptized for dead?* 1 *Cor.*15.29. Godly Martyrs would never be baptised with death, if the hope of a better resurrection did not animate their spirits to suffer death for the truths sake, being therin conformable to the death of Christ, *Phil.*3.10,11.

1 Cor.15.29.

By these two expressions (saith the Dialogue) which are *synonima* or equivalent, our Saviour doth inform the two sons of *Zebedee* what the true nature of his sufferings should bee, namely, no other, but such only, as they should one day suffer from the hands of Tyrants. And hence it follows,

1 That the troubled fear, which *Matthew* and *Mark* do ascribe unto Christ in the Garden, must bee understood of his natural fear of death, and not of his fear of his Fathers wrath.

2 Hence it follows, that all the (outward) sufferings of Christ, were from mans wrath and malice incited by the Devil, according to Gods decree declared in *Gen.*3.15. Thou Sathan shalt peirce him in the foot-soals.

Mr. *Norton* in page 62. doth thus answer to the Dialogues Exposition.

Herein (saith he) *is a fallacy, confounding such things as should bee divided: This Text*, saith *Piscator*, *is to be understood with an exception of that passion in which Christ felt the wrath of God for the Elect.*

Reply 11. It is most evident, that Mr. *Nortons* distinction is a fallacy, because it confounds things that differ, for it confounds

founds the death of Christs immortal soul, with the death of his body, & so he makes Christ to suffer two kinds of death formally, and so consequently he makes Christ to make two kinds of satisfaction formally; But saith the Dialogue, No other death but his bodily death is to be understood by *Mar.*10.39. & our larger Annotation doth fully concur with the Dialogues exposition on *Matth.*20.22,23. without any such exception, as Mr. *Norton* makes from *Piscator*: But I wonder that Mr. *Norton* dares honor *Piscator* so much as to take this exposition upon trust from him alone, seeing he makes the form of justification to lye only in remission of sins, which opinion of his, Mr. *Norton* doth damn for heresie, and yet now he so much honors *Piscator*, as to cite his judgement above for his exposition of this Text.

Mar.10.39. Mr. Nor. saith that Christ suffered a two-fold death in p.155 to 174. and he makes his immortal soul to be spiritually dead in p.159. and makes it the second death in p.115.

But for the better trying out of the truth, let us a little more narrowly search into the sense of *Mar.*10.39. by a cleer conference with the context, which I account to be a good rule for the trying out of a sound exposition.

1 *James* and *John* the sons of *Zebedee* desired of Christ, that the one might sit at his right hand, and the other at his left in his glorious Monarchy.

2 Thereupon Christ demanded of them, *Can yee drink of the cup that I shall drink of?* they said, *We can*; then Christ replied, *Yee shall indeed drink of the cup that I shall drink of.*

Hence it follows,

That seeing the cup of Christ was filled with the vindicative wrath of God, as Mr. *Norton* affirms, then *James* and *John* must drink of the same cup; for said Christ to them, *Yee shall drink of the same cup that I shall drink of.*

But I think Mr. *Norton* himself will say, that they did not drink of the cup of Gods vindicative wrath, but of the cup of an ignominious and violent death only.

Therefore it hence follows by the like consequence, that the death of Christ was of the same kind.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 63.

Christ suffered both as a Martyr, and as a Satisfier; the sons of Zebedee (saith he) *drank of the cup of Martyrdome, not of*

the cup of Satisfaction or Redemption; James and John were asleep whiles Christ was drinking that cup.

Reply 12. I grant, that Christ suffered as a Satisfier; but the only reason why the death of Christ was a death of satisfaction, was from the mutual Covenant that was made between the Trinity, it was their agreement that made the death of Christ to be a sacrifice of full satisfaction, or to be the full price of our redemption, as I have shewed also in Chap. 9. but because God made no such Covenant with the sons of *Zebedee*, therefore though they drank the cup of a violent death as Christ did, yet it was not for satisfaction, it was no more but the cup of Martyrdome in them: But as I said before, because the death of Christ was a death of Covenant, it was not only a death of Martyrdome, but it was a death of satisfaction also.

The only reason why the death of Christ was a death of satisfaction distinct from Martyrdome was the Covenant between the Trinity.

Secondly, I have often shewed from the first declared Will and Covenant of the Trinity, in *Gen.* 3. 15. that Christ covenanted to take upon him our nature of the seed of the deceived woman, and in that nature to break the Devils Head-plot by continuing obedient in his combate, notwithstanding Satans foul play to provoke him to some impatience, and in that obedience, he covenanted to make his soul a sacrifice, which God covenanted to reward with the redemption of all the Elect; and this was fully declared unto *Adam* by a typical sacrifice; and God gave the Devil full liberty to do his worst to disturb his patience, and so to spoyl his obedience, and so to prevent his death from being a sacrifice, and so to preserve his Head-plot from being broken; and this is comprehended in that sentence, Thou Satan shalt peirce him in the foot-soals; but God could not have declared all this, both to the Devil, and unto *Adam*, unless the second person had beforehand covenanted to undertake this conflict with the Devil, and his instruments, and unless God the Father had also covenanted, that the obedience of the seed of the woman, both in his conflict with Satan, and in his death and sacrifice, should break the Devils Head-plot, and so should thereby merit the salvation of all the Elect.

But thirdly, Observe this, that I do not say that the sufferings of Christ, which hee indured from the malice of Satan, and

and his instruments, were full satisfaction without his sacrifice in the formality of his death; but on the contrary, I say, that no sufferings, though never so great, can make satisfaction without his sacrifice in the formality of his death, by the separation of his soul from his body by his own Priestly power; and therefore if it could be supposed that Christ had born the moral curse of Hell-torments (according to Mr. *Norton's* Tenent) for a thousand years together on the Cross, yet without this his last Priestly act of death and sacrifice, it could not have been a sufficient price for our redemption; and the reason thereof is most cleer and evident, because God had ordained by his eternal Councel and Covenant, declared in *Gen.*3.15. that nothing should be accepted for full satisfaction to break the Devils Head-plot, without the true bodily death of the seed of the woman, made a sacrifice in the formality of it by his own Priestly power; he must be the only Priest in the formality of his own death and sacrifice, *Heb.*7.27. *Heb.*9.14,25,26,28. *Heb.*10.9,10,12.

Fourthly, Yet I grant, notwithstanding that all his sufferings from Satan, and his instruments, were ordained for the trial of his obedience, and so for his consecration to his Priestly Sacrifice, and in that respect it was as necessary to his sacrifice, as the consecration of the Priest was to the making of a sacrifice under the Law, I say, that both his consecration by his ignominious usage, and by his long lingring tortures on the Cross, and the formality of his death and sacrifice by his own Priestly power, must be considered as two distinct Articles of the eternal Covenant, though they must also be conjoyned for the making of that sacrifice, that God covenanted to accept for mans redemption; his sufferings as a Martyr from the malice of Satan was ordained for the trial of his perfect obedience, and so consequently for the perfecting of his Priestly consecration, as these Scriptures do witness, *Heb.*2.10. *Heb.*5.8,9. *Heb.*7.28. And when *Moses* put the blood of consecration on *Aarons* right Ear, Thumb, and great Toe, it figured, saith *Ainsw.* on *Lev.* 8,24. the sufferings of Christ, whose hands and feet were pierced; and then as soon as his consecration was finished, which was finished by finishing all the sufferings that were written of him; then hee declared the same by saying, *It is*

All Christs sufferings were as necessary to his sacrifice as the consecration of the Priest was to his sacrifice.

Heb 2.10. Heb.5.9. Joh.19.30. The sacrifice of Christ doth properly lye in the formality of his death by his own Priestly power. See also further in Reply 13.

finished, Joh.19.30. And then at the same instant, without any delay, he first bowed his head, and then he made his life a sacrifice by giving up the ghost; and this was in a differing order from that death that comes by the course of nature, for by the course of nature men do hold up the head as long as life is in the body, and then as soon as the soul is departed, the head falls; but Christ, while he was in the strength of nature, did first bow his head, and then hee gave up the ghost: And thus he performed his death as the Mediator of the New Covenant by his own Priestly power in both his natures, according to the eternal Covenant.

And in this last act by vertue of the said eternal Covenant lyes,

1 The formality of his death.

2 The formality of his sacrifice: And

3 The formality of all satisfaction, *Heb.*9.14,15,16. And therefore from hence it necessarily follows, that till this last act was done, no sufferings that went before (though he be supposed by Mr. *Norton* to have suffered the essential torments of Hell) though never so long, and never so strong, could bee accounted of God for satisfaction for mans Redemption.

Fifthly, All this was made manifest to fallen *Adam*, by Gods declared decree, in *Gen.*3.15. as I have formerly noted, and I think it needful to repeat it again with some inlargement.

1 God proclaimed an utter enmity between Christ the seed of the Woman, and the Devil in the Serpent, and in all other instruments of his malice.

2 Hee told the Devil (that hee might arm himself as well as hee could) that the seed of that deceived Woman should break his Head-plot, by continuing obedient to all the positive Laws of the combate, notwithstanding his foul play, and his malicious stratagems to disturb him in the course of his obedience.

3 Hee told the Devil, that hee should have full liberty to use him as a vilde Malefactor, and at last to peirce him in the foot-soals on the Cross to disturb his patience, and so to spoyl his obedience, and so to hinder his death from being a sa-

sacrifice of satisfaction, if he could.

In this manner, I say, God declared the plotform of the eternal counsel and Covenant of the Trinity for mans redemption; and therefore whatsoever is spoken after this of the Messiah, and of the work of Redemption, it must have reference to this first declaration; for all that is spoken after this is but a comment upon this, and all Christs sufferings are included in these two words. 1. He shall be the seed of the woman, and he shall be touched both inwardly with the feeling of our infirmities in all his voluntary passions.

Secondly, Outwardly, Thou Satan shalt peirce him in the foot-soals; And hence it is plain, that all his outward sufferings were to be from Satan and his instruments, and all his inward sufferings from himself. These things are so plain in the Text, that he that runs may read them; and these soul-passions with his outward sufferings were also ordained to consecrate Christ to his Priestly Office, before he could make his soul a sacrifice.

Thirdly, Therefore the formality of Christs obedience in his death and sacrifice, must needs be the period of all satisfaction; and this is the last victorious act of the Mediators obedience, that gives the fatal blow to the Devils head-plot, and breaks it all to peeces, so that the Elect are thereby delivered from his power, as a bird from the Fowler, when the snare is broken; and all the positive ceremonial Laws touching Priest and sacrifice are but a typical exemplification of this Priest and sacrifice.

Fourthly, Hence we may learn how to interpret all those Scriptures that ascribe all Christs sufferings both inward and outward to God; God is often said to be a doer of them all; but this first Declaration of Gods counsel to *Adam* tells us that God did all by appointing Satan to do all the external sufferings, and that God did appoint Christ (as he was the seed of the woman) to do all his internal sufferings; and thus God may be said to do all his soul-sufferings, because he was first in the order of that Covenant, where it was agreed on what Christ should suffer for mans redemption; He first expounded to the second person, that he should take mans nature of the seed of the woman, and mans infirmities, affections, and passions, that so he

God did all the external sufferings of Christ by Satan and his instruments, and Christ did all his internal soul-sufferings.

he might be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, as our merciful High-Priest, when the objects of fear, sorrow, and heaviness should present. In this sense God may be said to do all his soul-sufferings.

Fifthly, God is said to do all, because he delivered him into the hands of Satan, that Satan might do his worst in his combate with him, *Him being delivered* (saith Peter) *by the determinate counsel and fore-knowledge of God*, Act.2.23,24. (who delivered him but God? &c to whom did he deliver him, but to Satan to combate with him? according to Gods declared will, in *Gen.*3.15.) *ye have taken him, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain, whom God hath raised up, loosing the pains of death*; namely, loosing or healing the soars and wounds that were inflicted on his body by Satan and his instruments to put him to death; But no soars were inflicted on him by Gods immediate wrath, no other soars were put upon him, but such as God permitted the Devil and his instruments to inflict, out of a design to provoke his patience (as he did to *Job*) that so he might pervert him in his obedience, and spoil his death from being a sacrifice, and so might prevent the breaking of his first head-plot, which was to subdue *Adam* and all his posterity under the body of sin.

Act.2. 23,24.

So in *Rom.*4. 25. *He was delivered for our offences*; namely, God delivered him into the hands of Satan, according to *Gen.*3.15. to try masteries with Satan, and in case Satan could disturb his patience, then he should save his head-plot, but in case Christ did continue through all the combate, obedient to the positive Laws of the combate, to the death of the Cross, and at last in that perfect obedience make his soul a sacrifice, then he should redeem us from all our offences; And in this sense it was that Christ was delivered for our offences, and God raised him up again on the third day to witness our Justification, that his death was accepted of God as a Sacrifice for full satisfaction. And in this sense it is said, that *God spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all*, Rom.8.32.

Rom.4.25.

And thus I have shewed how Christ drunk the cup of martyrdom for his Priestly consecration to his sacrifice. And secondly, That the cup of satisfaction (by vertue of the free Covenant) lies both in his Combate and Sacrifice; but chiefly in his

Sacrifice, as the finishing act, and formal price of all satisfaction.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in pag. 63.

The sufferings of Christs soul were not by way of sympathy; his soul suffered properly and immediately, Isa. 53. 10. Matth. 26. 37. *The cause of his sufferings required that his soul should suffer as well as his body; We sinned in soul properly, therefore our surety must suffer in soul properly; the greatest of the sufferings of Christ were spiritual, and such as immediately seized on his soul.*

Reply 13. To deny that Christs soul suffered by way of sympathy, I suppose is to deny a truth: for the immortal soul is united personally to the body by the sensitive soul, and by vertue of this conjunction there is a communion, by which means the soul may partake of the sufferings of the body, by way of sympathy. There is a sympathy between the soul and body in sufferings.

There are three things, saith *Irenæus*, of which the intire perfect man consisteth, Flesh, Soul, and Spirit; The Soul, saith he, is betwixt the Flesh and Spirit, and sometimes following the Spirit, is elevated by it; and sometimes consenting to the Flesh, falls into earthly concupiscences: See Dr. *Hammonds* Annot. in 1 Thes. 5. 23.

And saith *Jerom*, The Soul consisting between the Flesh and Spirit, when it yeeldeth to the Flesh it is called flesh. By this it appears there is a communion by sympathy. And *Jerom* in Gal. 5.

But now because Christs humane nature was conceived by the Holy Ghost after the image of God, we must say that his rational Will did cause his sensitive Will to follow it, and therefore by his strong crying, and prayers, and tears, in the Garden, he obtained that his sensitive will which naturally abhorred and feared death, was at last made like unto his rational will, altogether fearless of death, and therefore as soon as he had done praying, he said to his Disciples, *Let us go meet them*, and then without any fear he went to meet all his sufferings, and so by the perfection of his patience under them, he did evidence the perfection of his obedience, and in that perfection of obedience he finished all that was written of him, and then he made his death a sacrifice by the joynt

concurrence of both his natures; and so at last without the least fear or striving in his sensitive will, he breathed out his immortal soul. But Mr. *Norton* confounds Christs sacrifice with his sufferings, and hee confounds his sufferings from Satan, with his sufferings from Gods immediate wrath, in pag. 153. 213, &c.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in the former place of p. 63.

His soul suffered properly and immediately.

The sufferings of Christs soul in Mat. 26. 38. and Isa. 53. 10. must chiefly be understood of Christs vital soul, and not of his immortal soul.

Reply 14. First, I have shewed in Chap. 12. at Sect. 4. that Christs soul did not suffer any thing at all from Gods immediate wrath.

Secondly, I have shewed, that the word Soul in these places, is not in the first place meant of Christs immortal soul, but of his vital soul; for *Nephesh* in Isa. 53. 10. and *Psyche* in Matt. 26. 38. (for it is not as Mr. *Norton* cites it in v. 37.) is not meant of Christs immortal soul, but of his sensitive soul; as I have before shewed in chap. 7.

Matth. 26. 38. Isa. 53. 10.

Nephesh, saith *Carlile*, is never used in the Old Testament for the immortal spirit, and *Psyche* is very seldom used in the New Testament for the immortal spirit, but (saith he) it is abundantly used for the sensitive soul; *Paul* said to *Epaphroditus*, that *for the work of Christ he was nigh unto death, not regarding his Soul*, Phil. 2. 30.

And (saith Christ) *The good Shepherd layeth down his soul for his sheep*, Joh. 10. 11. And saith Christ, *I am the good Shepherd, I lay down my soul*, Joh. 10. 15. *I therefore doth my father love me, because, I lay down my soul, and take it again*, Joh. 10. 17. *No man taketh it from me, I lay it down of my self*, ver. 18. *The Son of man came to serve, and to give his soul for the ransom of many*, Mat. 20. 28. *He made his soul a sin*, Isa. 53. 10. *and powred out his soul to death*, Isa. 53. 12.

Joh. 10. 15, 17, 18

Thirdly, Saith *Fulgentius*, The wholeman (Christ) laid down his soul, when his soul departed, dying on the Cross. In this sentence you see that *Fulgentius* speaks of two souls in Christ. First, Saith he, Christ laid down his (vital) soul. And then secondly, saith he, his (immortal) soul departed dying on the Cross.

ad Trasi. li. 3.

Fourth-

Fourthly, The soul that died in Christ for our redemption was this vital soul, for this kind of soul hath its seat in the blood, *Gen.9.4.* and when Christ shed his blood, this soul of his was powred out (and then his immortal soul departed) and this was typified by the vital soul of the beast, that was in the blood, of the Levitical Sacrifices, in *Lev.17.11.* and see *Ainsw.* also in *Deut.12.23.* the soul of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the Altar to make attonement for your souls, for it is the blood that maketh attonement for the soul (this I noted in the Dialogue, pag. 94.) and this positive ceremonial type was given to the *Jews* to exemplifie their attonement and redemption by the shedding of the vital soul that was in the blood of Christ; and our Saviour did confirm this to be a truth at his last Supper, saying, *this cup is the New Testament in my blood which is shed for you*, and for the many for the remission of sins, *Matth.26.28.* And he was the Mediator of the New Testament by this death, *Heb.9.15.* And his death in ver.15,16,17. is exemplified by the bodily death of men, whose death doth make the legacies of their testament to be valid; and so in like sort, until Christ had powred out his vital soul, his Legacies of the New Testament were not confirmed; but as soon as that act was done they were all confirmed for the many, *Dan.9.27.* And by his death he is said to make peace or attonement, *Col.1.20.* as *Aarons* incense did, in *Numb.16.44.* See *Ainsw.* and by which we have redemption, *Ephes.1.7.* and by which we are ransomed, *Matth.20.28.* It is this vital blood of Christ that cleanseth us from all sin, 1 *Joh.1.7.*

The death of satisfaction was by the true bodily death of Christ, and not by his spiritual death.

This vital blood of Christ was it that was ordained to procure Gods everlasting attonement for all our moral sins, even as the blood of Bulls, &c. was ordained to procure Gods attonement for their ceremonial sins, *Heb.9.12,13,14,15,16. Heb.10.*

Fifthly, saith *P. Martyr*, Because blood is the life, God would signifie that sin is not purged by sacrifice, unless it were by death.

P.Martyr in his com.pl. par.2. p.581.

Sixthly, Mr. *Carlile* doth thus paraphrase on *Lev.17.11.* I have appointed the blood to be an expiation and purgation for you, even for your sins: for it is this blood that purgeth you.

Seventhly, From the ſpringing up of corn after it is dead in the earth, Chriſt brings a ſimilitude of his death, and of the fruit of his death, *Joh.* 12. 24. None that I can find interpret this death of any other death but the true bodily death and ſacrifice of Chriſt.

Tindals works p. 462. Eighthly, *Tindal* ſaith thus, *Paul* concludeth in *Heb.* 9. 16, 17. that Chriſt muſt needs have dyed, ſaying, That wheresoever a Teſtament is, there muſt the death of the Teſtament-maker go between, or elſe the Teſtament is not ratified and ſure.

But (ſaith he) Righteouſneſs and Remiſſion of ſins in Chriſts blood is the New Teſtament, whereof hee is the Mediator.

Ergo, The Teſtament-maker muſt needs have dyed.

And (ſaith he) he muſt, or it behoved him to die, for he took our very mortal nature for the ſame decreed council, ſaying, *It behoved that the Son of man muſt die*, Joh. 12. *Tindal* laies the whole weight of all the bleſſings of the new Covenant on the bodily death of Chriſt; he makes no mention of the ſpirituall death of Chriſts ſoul. And ſaith he in pag. 257. The offerings of Chriſts body and blood is the onely ſatisfaction for our ſins. And ſaith he, There is no other way to ſalvation but by Chriſts death and paſſion, and he ſpeaks this of his bodily death. And ſaith he, whoſoever goeth unto God, and unto forgiveneſs of ſins, or ſalvation, by any other way than this, the ſame is an Heretick.

Here *Tindal* oppoſeth his judgement of Hereſie to Mr. *Nortons* judgement.

Ninethly, We die a double death, ſaith *Chryſoſtom* (as I formerly cited him) therefore we muſt look for a double Reſurrection; But Chriſt, ſaith he, dyed but one kind of death, therefore he roſe but one kind of Reſurrection. *Adam* dyed both in body and ſoul, he dyed to ſin, and to nature, &c. The firſt is the death of the ſoul, the other is the death of the body, for the death of the ſoul is ſin, or everlaſting puniſhments.

To us men there is a double death, and therefore we muſt have a double Reſurrection.

To Chriſt there was but one kind of death, for he ſinned not, and that one kind of death was for us; he owed no kind

kind of death, for he was not subject to sin, and so not to death.

Tenthly, *Theodoret* in Dialogue 3. saith, How could the soul of our Saviour, having an immortal nature, and not touched with the least spot of sin, be possibly taken with the hook of death? In these words he doth plainly and fully deny the spiritual death of Christs immortal soul, and therefore he is point blank against Mr. *Norton*.

Eleventhly, *Cyril de Recta fide ad Reginas*, l. 1. saith, If wee conceive Christ to be God incarnate, and suffering in our flesh, the death of his flesh alone sufficeth for the redemption of the world.

Twelfthly, *Fulgentius*, and fifteen Bishops of *Africa* made this confession of their Faith. The death of the Son of God which he suffered in his flesh alone, destroyed in us both our deaths, to wit, the death of the soul and body. But Mr. *Norton* holds this confession made in the Dialogue to bee Heresie.

Thirteenthly, *Fulgentius ad Transimundum*, l. 2. c. 7. saith, When the flesh onely died, and was raised again in Christ, the Son of God is said to have died.

Ibidem c. 5. The flesh dying, not onely the Deity, but the soul of Christ cannot be shewed to have been dead also.

Fourteenthly, *Gregory* on *Job* l. 4. c. 17. Coming to us who were in the death of the spirit and flesh, Christ brought his ONE DEATH to us, and looſed both our deaths, his single death he applied to our double death, and dying, vanquished our double death.

Fifteenthly, *August. in ser.* 162. saith, But the immortal righteous Son of God coming to die for us, in whose flesh, because there could be no sin, he suffered the punishment of sin without the guilt thereof, wherefore he admitted for us the second part of the first death, that is to say, the death of the body onely, by which he took from us the dominion of sin, and the pain of eternal punishment.

And saith he, in Ser. 129. There is a first and a second death; of the first death there are two parts, one when the sinful soul by offending departed from her Creator; and the other where-

by the soul for her punishment was excluded from the body by Gods Justice. The second death is the everlasting torments of body and soul. This distinction of the first and second death Mr. *Norton* disputes against. And in Epist.99. He saith, Surely the soul of Christ was neither dead with any sin, nor punished with damnation, which are the two ways how the death of the soul may possibly be understood. But Mr. *Norton* hath found out a third way for the death of Christs soul by his penal Hell in this world, which he makes to have the same essential torments that are in fiery *Gehenna*.

16. *Beda in Homil. Feria 4. in Quadragesima* saith, Christ coming to us that were in death of Body and Spirit, suffered onely one death, that is the death of the flesh, and freed us of both our deaths, he applied his ONE DEATH to our double death, and vanquished them both.

17. *Albinus* in *Quæst.* on *Genesis* saith, What is meant by this, *Thou shalt die the death?* It meaneth a double death in man, to wit, Soul and Body; the death of the Soul is, when God for sin forsaketh it, the death of the Body is, when through any necessity the body is deprived of the soul. This double death of ours, Christ destroyed with his single death, for he died onely in the flesh for a time, but in soul he never died who never sinned.

18. *Bernard ad milites Templi* c.12. saith, Of our two deaths, whereof the one is the desert of sin, the other the due punishment, Christ taking our punishment, but clear from sin, whiles he dyed willingly, and onely in body, he merieth for us life and righteousness. Had Mr. *Norton* lived in their days, durst he have condemned this Doctrine for Heresie, as now he doth? I trow not, he might rather have expected a sharp censure from them.

19. *Bullinger* on *Isa.*53.10. *Homil.*153. saith, Whole Christ was the expiation of our sins, though during that time neither his Divinity suffered, nor his soul dyed, but his flesh, whereof the blessed Fathers *Vigilius* and *Fulgentius* have religiously disputed against Heretickes.

20. No other death but a bodily death was typified, as I have shewed from *Lev.*17.11. and this also was typified by the death

death of the High Priest, which was ordained by Gods positive Law and Covenant for the redemption of the exiled person that was exiled by the Law for unwitting murder: for by the Law he was to continue an exile as long as the High Priest lived, but as soon as the High Priest was dead (be it longer or shorter in time) then, & not till then the exiled person was thereby redeemed from the avenger of blood, *Num.* 35. 25. and this makes the reason of the type to be the more eminent, because in all other Nations the unwitting Man-slayer is freed at the first Sessions of Justice; but by Gods positive Ordinance in *Israel*, he must continue an exile till the death of the High Priest; hee could not be redeemed sooner, not by any other way from the danger of the avenger of blood, but onely by the death of the High Priest; this is an evident type of our redemption by the bodily death and sacrifice of our High Priest Christ Jesus. Numb. 35. 25.

21. The Reader shall find in several other Chapters several other Divines that do accord with these.

Hence two Conclusions do follow.

First, That Christs soul was not spiritually dead with the second death, as *Mr. Norton* doth unadvisedly hold for an Orthodox Evangelical Tenet.

Secondly, That his death was a true bodily death, namely, such a bodily death, as in the formality of it was a Sacrifice.

But *Mr. Norton* in p. 70. saith.

It is a fiction to assert any divine prediction that Christ should onely suffer a bodily death.

And saith he in p. 59.

It had been of none effect if he had suffered onely a bodily death, and to this effect he speaks in p. 170, 173, 174. 160, 162, &c.

22. But for the better clearing of the true nature of Christs death, I will out of *Christopher Carlile* describe the vital soul; *Nephes* (saith *Carlile*) is never applied to the immortal soul in all the Bible. See *Carlile* in his descent p. 144, &c.

2. Saith

A true description of the vital soul.

2 Saith he, *Nephes*, which the Greeks have translated *Psyche*, the Latines *animam*, the English *soul*, hath its name in Hebrew, Chaldee, Greek and Latine, of breathing, because it cooleth and refresheth with respiring and breathing, page 145.

3 *Nephes* consisteth in blood, breath, life, vital spirit, affections and passions, &c. As for example.

1 *Nephes* is the blood, *Lev.*17.4,10,11. the life of every living creature is in the blood; And this *Nephes* is mortal, and therefore it is called *Nephes Caja*; but the immortal spirit is called *Neshama Cajim*, the spirit of lives; This is immortal, and dyes not as *Nephes Caja* doth.

2 This *Nephes* is often put for the vital soul, as in *Gen.* 35.18. *Gen.*44.30. *Exod.*4.19. *Jos.*2.13. *Isa.*53. 10,11,12. &c. in page 149.

3 *Nephes* is put for the mind, heart, and inward parts, *Prov.* 16.24. *Prov.*19.18. *Prov.*23.6. *Prov.*25,12.

4 *Nephes* is put for the affections either of joy or sorrow, as in *Psal.* 25.1. it is put for cheerful affections. See *Ainsworth* there, and in *Psal.*86.4.

It is also put for the affections of compassion, in *Isa.* 58.10.

It is also put for the affections of sorrow and sadness, 1 *Sam.* 1.15. *Psal.*42.5. *Psal.*62.9. *Lam.*3.12.

It is also put for vexation of mind, *Deut.*28.65.

It is also put for the grief and pain which they sustained in captivity, as it is expounded in vers.64.66. and 2 *King.*4.27. *Job* 7.11. *Job* 10.1. *Psal.*13.2.

It is also put for the inward powers, *Job* 21.23. *Psal* 107.26. *Prov.*14.1.

Likewise in the New Testament Psyche, *the vital soul, is put*

1 For a willing heart, *Eph.*6.6. *Col.*3.23.

2 For one mind, *Act.*4.31. *Phil.*1.27.

3 For the heart, soul, and mind, *Matth.*22.37. *Toto tuo sensitivo*, as *Lyra* interpreteth; with all thy wisdome, diligence, and cogitation, as *Chrysostome*; with all thy life, and with all thy mind, as *Austin*; with all thy will and mind, as *Glossa ordinaria*; with all thy life which thou oughtest to yeeld up for him, as *Origen.*

Origen. See also *Deut.* 6. 5. *Luke* 10. 27. *Mark* 12. 30. *Rom.* 12. 1.

4 *Phebe* in the New Testament doth signifie for the most part the same that *Nephes* doth in the Old.

But saith *Carlile*, in three places it signifies the immortal soul, as in *Mat.* 10. 27, 28. *Jam.* 1. 21. 1 *Pet.* 1. 9.

And saith hee, This kind of soul was that soul of Christ that was so exceeding sorrowful in *Mat.* 26. 38.

By nature, saith *Carlile* in page 155. All the parts of my body wherein there is any life, do fear death, my will is unwilling, my mind vexed, my affections moved, my heart is wounded, my members shake, my breast panteth, my legs faint, my hands tremble, and my senses are amazed.

A true description of the natural fear of death.

And saith hee, The flesh of Christ was so troubled, that hee desired, if it were possible, that he might escape death, *Mat.* 26. 38 *Mar.* 14 34. *Joh.* 12. 27.

2. Mr. *Wilmot* renders the word, περίλυπος in *Matth.* 26. 38. (which we translate exceeding sorrowful) by rounded about with sorrow, for fear of his approaching ignominious death; hee was rounded about in every part of his body according to the description above from *Carlile*; and so *David* saith of his fear, *The sorrows of death compassed me about*, Psal. 18. 5. And by this expression it appears, that hee was in every part of his sensitive soul, blood and flesh, in a quaking fear. Mr. *Ainsworth* doth render it the pangs of death, or the pains, throwes, and sorrows as of a woman in child-birth, and so doth the original signifie in *Hos.* 13. 13, *Isa.* 13. 8. *Isa.* 66. 7. And so doth the Chaldee explain it, Anguish compassed mee as of a woman which sitteth in the birth, and hath no strength to bring forth, being in danger of death; Methinks these emphatical expressions of the fear of a bodily death should check such as sleight them that expound the fear of Christ, of his exceeding natural fear of his bodily death.

Mat. 26. 38.

Psal. 18. 5.

3. When our Saviour at Supper told his Disciples that one of them should betray him, they were exceeding sorrowful, *Mat.* 26. 21, 22. namely, they were in every part of their body, περίλυποι surrounded about with sorrows, and Christ doth compare their sorrows for his death to the pangs of a woman in travel, *Joh.* 16. 20, 21, 22. The Greek word in verse 22. and

in verse 38 is the same, and the Syriak doth translate them alike, and *Tremelius* doth translate the Syriack in both places with the same Latine word.

So that the natural fear of an ignominious violent death doth extend it self to every part of the vital soul and body.

SECT. IV.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 87.

His sorrow was lethal and deadly, both intensively and extensively continuing unto the last gaspe whereinto by killing of it self in time, had there been no other causes, resolving and melting the soul gradually, as wax is melted with the heat, Psal. 22. 14.

Christs soul-sorrows could not be lethal and deadly, because they were governed by right reason.

Reply 1. In these words Mr. *Norton* doth make Christs body to be subject to death by natural causes, not only externally, but also internally, from his soul-sorrows, as if he might now lose the rectitude of his own pure humane affections.

His heart indeed, according to his voluntary Covenant to undertake our nature and passions, did melt, for fear of his ignominious and painful death, in the midst of his bowels, in his preparation to encounter it in the Garden, but after a while by his strong crying and tears hee did overcome that fear, and obtained a confirmation of his nature against his natural fear.

But I wonder how Mr. *Norton* can say (as hee doth often) that Christs sorrows were lethal and deadly, and continuing to the last gasp, seeing all his affections were regular, and conformed to right reason? can regular affections admit of such a kind of sorrow, without sin? I think not, and yet I conceive that the measure of regular sorrow may bee so great, that it cannot well bee prescribed by us, otherwise than in the Scripture phrases, which must not bee stretched by the conceptions of men, beyond the context: But to affirm that the kind of his sorrow was lethal and deadly of it self, is as much as to say it was excessive and beyond the rule of right reason, which must needs be sinful; and it is worse to say that his lethal sorrows con-

continued to the last; And therefore Mr. *Norton* kind of reasoning is most dangerous: All Christs affections saith *A. Hunter*, were in him voluntary, they did rise in him when he pleased to shew them, and they appeared not when he pleased to suppress them, but in us (saith he) they are often involuntary, and rise in us whether we will or no.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 88.

Christ was amazed; He began to be sore amazed, Mark 14.33. *which signifieth an universal cessation of all the faculties of the soul from their several functions; Physicians call it a Horripilation, we usually a Consternation, like a Clock in kilter, yet stopped for the Bible from going by some hand laid upon it; That such intermission of the operations of his soul, the effect of this formidable Concussion, might be without sin, is evident to him that remembers Christ slept, sleep ordinarily implying cessation of the exercise of the intellectual faculties.* Mar. 14. 33.

Reply 16. The word translated Amazed (saith hee) signifies an universal cessation of all the faculties of the soul from their several functions: I acknowledge, that the signification of the original is of necessary use for the right expounding of the blessed Scriptures, provided the original word be not stretched to a sense beyond the context, or else there is great danger of abusing the Scripture to an erronious sense, as I have formerly noted from the large signification of *Sheol* and *Hades* in Chap. 7. and from *Nasa* and *Sabel*, in Chap. 11. And the like I must say of this Greek word *Ethambeisthai*; For Christ was not fully amazed.

1 *Ethambesin* is used by the Septuagint in 1 *King.* 14. 15. to express the sense of the Hebrew word *Ragaz*, to root, namely to root up *Israel* out of that good land.

2 The Septuagint put *Thambos* for a dead sleep, namely, for that dead sleep that was fallen upon *Saul* and his men, when their senses were so bound up that they could not awake, 1 *Sam.* 26. 12.

3 The Septuagint put *Thamboumenos* (to express the sense of *Rachan*) for light headed, or inconstant persons, in *Judges* 9. 4. This Hebrew word, saith *Ainsworth*, in *Gen.* 49. 4. doth

signifie unstable, or light, and soon moved; And this word (saith he) is always used in the evil part, *Zeph.*3.4. *Jer.* 23.32.

These three senses considered, who dares say (that is well advised) that this Greek word *Ethambeisthai*, in *Mark* 14.33. ought to bee stretched to the utmost sense of the word; these, and such like things, I find by conference with the Septuagint in *Kirkeroes.*

2 I wonder why Mr. *Norton* saith, That Physicians call it a *Horripilation*; doth hee think that Christ was in such a dreadful distemper of mind and body, that it made his hair to stand upright? why else doth hee bring a name for it from that distemper of nature, which is called by the Physicians, a *Horripilation*; I never heard that Christs humane nature was subject to diseases till now: Truly Mr. *Norton* seems to have too mean a conceit of the perfection of Christs humane nature in his Agony.

3 The Text doth not say as Mr. *Norton* doth, That Christ was fully amazed in a passive sense, but that hee began to bee amazed, in an active sense, and there is as much difference between being fully amazed, and beginning to be amazed, as there is between a sound sleep, and beginning to bee asleep; when *Peter* walked on the Sea to go to Christ, hee began to sink, and yet he did not sink, *Matt.*14.30. So though Christ began to be amazed, yet he was not fully amazed, hee voluntarily began to be amazed in consideration of that unnatural and terrible evil of an ignominious and violent death on the Cross, which was now at hand to bee inflicted on him by Satan, whom God had armed with authority to do it in the most ignominious and violent lingring manner that he could devise, according to *Gen.*3.15. to provoke his patience.

Gen.3.15.

But yet he was far from being so amazed as Mr. *Norton* doth make the word (according to its large sense) to speak: Hee saith that the original word signifieth an universal cessation of all the faculties of the soul from their vital functions; what though the word in the largest extent doth signifie so much?

Yet I say also, that Christ was not so amazed; he was not fully overcome with fear, as men amazed are; for if all the fa-

faculties of his soul had now ceased universally from their several functions (as Mr. Norton affirmeth) then how could Christ at this very instant have behaved himself so Religiously and advisedly as he did? for now hee uttered words of reason, and understanding, words of counsel and advice to his Disciples, even at the same time when hee began to bee amazed, telling his Disciples in what manner hee began to bee amazed, he said unto them, *My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even to death*, or even to consider the manner of my usage in the time of my death, *Mar.* 14. 33, 34. or thus, I am surrounded with the sorrows of death, as I have opened the Greek word a little before on *Matth.* 26. 38. And then also hee said unto his Disciples (as one that had the use of his intellects) *Tarry ye here and watch me*; or as *Luke* expresseth it, *Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation*, Luke 22. 40. and then hee went a little forward, and fell on the ground, and prayed, *That if it were possible that hour* (of his dread) *might passe from him*, namely, his natural dread of that Satanical usage that was at hand, vers. 34, 35.

Do not all these circumstances of his wise and religious deportment prove that he was not amazed, though at first he did voluntarily begin to bee amazed. Methinks a judicious Divine should look as well into the circumstances of the Text, as into the largest sense of the word. Methinks a judicious Divine should know and beleeve, that Christ had at this time all the powers and faculties of reason, and understanding in a far more excellent measure than any other man whatsoever that is in his best senses, and that the faculties of his soul were so perfect, that they could not cease universally from their several functions in the time of executing his office.

All his passions were voluntary, and followed the rule of right reason, saith *Damascen*; and therefore he could not bee so amazed as Mr. *Norton* definition doth charge Christ to bee.

4. Let us try the sense that is given to the word by other Translators, who minded the sense of the Context more than the largest extent of the word.

1 *Tremelius* doth translate the Syriack word, which is the same both in, *Mat.* 26.37. and in *Mark.* 14.33. I say he translates the Syriack in both places alike, though the Greek words do differ, he translates *Mat.* 26.37. thus, *Et cœpit mœstus esse, & tristitia affici*, and he translates *Mark.* 14.33. thus, *Et cœpit mœstus esse & affici tristitia.*

2 *Tindal* doth translate *Mar.* 14.33. thus, And he began to be abashed, and to be in an agony.

3 The Geneva thus, he began to be troubled, and to be in great heaviness.

4 The Seventy render this Greek word by several Hebrew words, that signifie Frighted, Feared, Terrified, and the like, as *Dan.* 8.17. *At the sight of the Angel* (saith he) *I was afraid, and fell on my face*; In this his fear he used the same gesture of reverence that Christ did in his prayers, and this gesture was suitable to one that had the use of his intellects.

2 The Seventy use this Greek word to explain the Chalde word in *Dan.* 7.7. which we translate Terrible, and so terrible was the apprehension of an ignominious violent death to Christs humane nature.

3 The Seventy use this Greek word to translate the Hebrew word, which we translate Haste; namely such a haste as ariseth from the sudden fear of death, and of such like evils, as in 2 *King.* 7.15.

This Hebrew word saith *Ainsworth*, in *Deut.* 16.3. implies a trembling, and a hasty flight from the fear of danger, as in *Deut.* 20.3. *You approach this day unto the battel against your enemies, let not your hearts fear, and hasten not away, neither be yee terrified* (namely, with the fear of death) *because of them.* And this haste, saith *Ainsworth* in *Psal.* 31. 23. is through amazement or fear, as the word commonly intendeth. And that *David* through the fear of death did hast away from *Saul*, is evident, by 1 *Sam.* 23.26. But yet this is to be noted, that his fear or amazement was not in such a degree as Mr. *Nortons* definition doth hold forth, for if all the faculties of his soul had now ceased universally from their several functions, then *David* had not been capable to contrive such a wise course for his safety, as he did on a sudden.

4 *Ethambesan*

4. *Ethambesan* is used by the Seventy to interpret the Hebrew word *Bagnab*, in 2 *Sam.* 22. 5. which we translate fear, *The floods of wickedness* (saith *David*) *made me afraid.* The former part of the verse runs thus, *The waves of death compassed me*; the Seventy for compassed have [illegible], so Christ was [illegible], exceeding sorrowful, compassed or surrounded about (in every part of his body) with the fears of death, *Matth.* 26. 38. And so *David* said just as Christ said, *The waves of death compassed me, the floods of wickedness made me* Ethambesan *afraid*; and so said Christ to his Disciples, I am rounded about with the fears of death, *Matth.* 26. 38. and the floods of wickedness make me *Ethambesthai*, very heavy, or afraid; as the Seventy by that word do render the Hebrew word, in 2 *Sam.* 22. 5. 2 Sam. 22. 5. Mat. 26. 38.

5. The Seventy use the same Greek word for fear or terror, as in *Cant.* 6. 4, 10. and in *Cant.* 8. 7. *Eccles.* 12. 5. *Ezek.* 7. 18.

The thing I aim at by citing all these Translations, is, to shew that Mr. *Nortons* definition of the word *Amazed*, in *Mark.* 14. 33. is larger than these Translations above cited do make it to be, and larger than the context will own.

I do not think therefore that Christ was ever under such a degree of amazement as Mr. *Nortons* definition holds forth.

6. Neither is his comparison suitable to express that Christ was so amazed; for Mr. *Norton* compares the universal cessation of the exercise of all the faculties of Christs immortal soul from their several functions in his amazement, to the cessation of the intellectual faculties in the time of sound sleeping; any man may see that this comparison is no way fit: for though the Intellects cease from exercise during the time of sound sleeping, yet that is but to refresh nature for the better performance of its office, but by Mr. *Nortons* definition of Christs amazement he was dis-inabled thereby from doing the proper duties of his office, in the very time that he was to exercise his office; it was not now a time for all the faculties of his soul to cease from their proper functions, as in the time of sleeping, when there is no known danger at hand, as there was now. Doubtless to affirm that Christ was so amazed at this time, is no less than to make Christ a sinner formally, as I have

By consequence Mr. *Norton* doth impute the sin of unmindfulness to Christ in the time of exercising his Office.

have shewed in the opening of Job. 19. 28, 30. in Chap. 4. Sect. 8. He could not be any further amazed than his perfect rational Will thought most suitable to the conditions of his Covenant, which was to be touched with a quick sense of our passions when he would, and as much as he would; The Devil indeed did labor to deprive him of his reasonable soul, as it is evident by his plotting of his ignominious and violent death, and he labored to bring him into such amaze, as Mr. *Norton* speaks of, and if he could have effected it, he had won the victory; but blessed be God, this wise servant was never no otherwise amazed but as himself pleased to trouble himself, Job. 11. 33. I confess, I find the same Doctrine in M. *Weaks* portraiture, p. 248. He makes Christ forgetful in his Office, as M. *Norton* doth, by reason of the Agony astonishing his senses; and thus this corrupt tenent doth spread like leven, but saith Dr. *Williams* in p. 447. the passion of fear could not divert him from his desire, nor darken his understanding, nor disturb his memory, nor any way hinder him in the execution of his Office.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in p. 88.

He began not meerly to be amazed, but also to be very heavy, the word notes expavefaction, *which was such a motion of his mind superadded to his consternation, whereby for the time he was disinabled as concerning the minding of any thing else, being wholly taken up with the dreadful sense of the righteous wrath of God, as the eye intrinsecally fixed upon some object, taketh no notice of any other object before it for the while.*

Reply 17. As I said of the former word *Amazed*, so I say of this word *very heavy*, it must not be stretched beyond the context; But I have shewed that he hath stretched the word *Amazed* beyond the context; therefore seeing he doth stretch this word *very heavy* beyond the word *amazed*, It follows, that he doth also stretch the Greek word *Ademonein* beyond the context.

Mr. *Norton* stretches the word, *very heavy* in Mark 14. 33 beyond the context.

Try it by some Translations. *Tremelius* doth translate the Syriack signification of this word *Tristitia*; And *Tindal* doth translate it *Agony*; And the *Geneva*, *great heaviness*; and Mr. *Broughton*,

Broughton, full of heaviness; And the Seventy by this Greek word do translate the Hebrew word *Shamam*, in *Job* 18.20. which we translate, Affrighted, and the Geneva, Fear, and Mr. *Broughton*, Horror.

All these words in these translations doe well agree to that great natural fear and heavinesse that Christ assumed at the sudden approach of his ignominious and painful death, and the thought of it was much in his mind, as it appears by his manifold speeches of it to his Apostles, in *Matth.* 16.21. and 17.22,23. and 20.18,19,24. and 21.38. *Joh.* 12.27. and therefore his mind was not dis-inabled at this time from thinking of it, and it was the main request of his prayers to get a confirmation against his natural fear of it.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in p. 88.

His mind was wholly taken up with the dreadful sense of the righteous wrath of God.

Reply 18. These words do make it evident why hee doth stretch the exposition of the two Greek words beyond the context, namely, for this very end, that hee may hook in the dreadful sense of the righteous wrath of God upon Christs soul; But I have said enough, I think, to confound this assertion.

And other Diviner give another sense of Christs soul-sorrows in the Garden.

Dr. *Lightfoot* in his harmony on the New Testament, p. 65. saith thus, In an Agony he sweats drops like blood; All the powers of hell being let loose against Christ, as it never was against person upon earth before or since, and that from the pitching of the field of old, *Gen.* 3.15. thou shalt pierce him in the heel; so that it was not so much for any pangs of hell that Christ felt within him, as for the assaults of hell that he saw inlarged against him, that he was so full of sorrow and anguish. This testimony to the truth of Gods Declaration in *Gen.* 3.15. doth fully accord with the Dialogue.

2 Mr. *Robert Wilmot* in his manuscripe on *Haidet*, saith thus on the word *Always*, in *Act.* 2. 25.

Always (saith he) even in his sorest agonies.

1 Before the sweaty Agony, his soul was troubled, yet then he called God Father, *Joh.* 12. 27.

2 When he was in the Agony he could still call God Father, *Luk.* 22. 44. and in *Joh.* 11. 42. he saith, he knew God heard him alwaies, and therefore even then he must needs have comfort.

3 When he began to be ἀδημονεῖν, most grievously tormented and φιλυπος i. φιλοῦς λυπαρὸς, abundantly sorrowful or rounded about with sorrow, yet then he could still call God Father, *Matth.* 26. 37, 38, 39, 42.

4 When the betrayer was come, and the Band had seized on him, yet then also he uttered words of sure comfort and confidence, *Mat.* 26. 53. *Thinkest thou* (said he to *Peter*) *that I cannot pray to my Father, and he shall set before mee more than twelve legions of Angels.*

5 When he was upon the cross, and cryed, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me*, Doth not the very fore-front of that speech ascertain us that he had even then comfort in his God? *Mat.* 27. 46.

6 Had he not strong comfort in God his Father at the giving up of the Ghost, when he said, *Father into thy hands I commend my spirit?* Luk. 23. 46.

If then through all his sufferings he could pray to his Father, as we see, and knew his father heard him ever, then surely he had comfort in his Father ever; yea, if through all his sufferings he called him by the fiducial and cordial name Father, we cannot imagine but that he conceived and applied the comfort contained in the name, when ever he did mention the name, else how conceive we that his heart and mouth did go together?

These observations of Mr. *Wilmots* do evidence that Christs mind was not wholly taken up with the dreadfull sense of the righteous wrath of God, when he began to be amazed, and to be very heavy, as Mr. *Norton* doth affirm.

SECT.

SECT. 5.

Christs Agony, and Luk. 22.44. Examined.

MR. *Norton* in pag. 63. doth thus abbreviate the Dialogues words.

If the circumstances of this Agony be well weighed (saith the Dialogue) it will appear, that it did not proceed from his Fathers wrath, but from his natural fear of death onely; because he must be stricken with the fear of death, as much as his true humane nature could bear; he must be touched with the fear of death in a very great measure (as the Prophets did foretel)

Add to these pains of his mind, his earnest prayers to be delivered from his natural fear of death; the fear of death doth often cause men to sweat, and earnest prayer doth often cause men to swear.

As he was man he must be touched with the fear of death, for a time, and as he was Mediator he must fully and wholly overcome his natural fear of death by his prayers; therefore there was a necessity for him to strive in prayer, until he had overcome it.

Mr. *Norton* doth thus answer in p. 64.

There can no reason be given, why the fear of death should be as much as the humane nature of Christ could bear without sin, because the object of that fear may be and is exceeded; penal spiritual death is a greater object of fear incomparably.

Reply 19. I have already replyed to this very answer in substance, in the first Section of this Chapter: But yet I reply further with the Dialogue, That the law of Mediatorship did require that he should take our nature, together with our true natural (but yet sinless) infirmities, *Gen.* 3.15. *Heb.* 4.15. and seeing he was conceived of the seed of the woman by the power of the Holy Ghost, our nature and natural affections were transcendent in him, and therefore according to those transcendent

scendent natural passions, he could not chuse but abhor death, more than any sinful man, and therefore he did often trouble himself with the thought of it, as he made it evident by his speeches often itterated to his Disciples about his ignominious death and sufferings at *Jerusalem*; but at his last Supper, and in the Garden, when his death was nigh at hand, he did more pathetically express his natural dread and abhorrence of it, first to his Disciples, and then to God in his prayers, *Matth.* 26.37,38. for he knew by Gods declared will in *Gen.* 3.15. that God had armed the Devil with power to apprehend him, to condemn him, and to put him to that ignominious torturing death of the cross, as a sinful malefactor.

I say the consideration of this usage could not chuse but work a greater dread and abhorring in the humane nature of Christ, than the like can do to us, because of the pure constitution of his nature, as I have noted it in Sect. 1. Our nature by reason of original sin is become the slave of death, *Heb.* 2.14. and therefore we cannot abhor it with so much true natural detestation, as the pure nature of Christ might do and did, and therefore his natural fear of death was transcendent to ours.

But saith he, Penal spiritual death is a greater object incomparably, he takes it for granted that Christ suffered a penal spiritual death, which is denied: But in case such a Tenent were indeed held forth in the book of God, then methinks the blessed Scriptures should insist most upon it, seeing it is held to be the main matter of full and just satisfaction, but the contrary is evident to me, namely, that the Scriptures do insist most upon his ignominious torturing bodily death from Satan, and upon his sacrifice, as soon as ever he had finished all his sufferings, and had evidenced his obedience to be perfect through sufferings.

The Dialogue saith thus in p. 49.

It is no marvel then that our Savior fell into such an Agony the night before his death, seeing it was not an easie thing to alter the property of nature, from a desire to live, to a desire to die, and that not for his own end and benefit, but for the sake of the Elect onely; and all this must he perform in exact obedience

obedience to his Fathers will, he must observe the due time of every action, and so on, as it follows in Mr. *Norton* citation in page 64.65.

Mr. *Norton* doth answer thus in page 63.

Your mentioning other causes (though false) of Christs fear, besides his natural death only, is a secret acknowledgement that his fear of a natural death only was not a sufficient cause of his exceeding sorrows before his death.

Reply 20. The Dialogue shews plainly, that the approach of his ignominious and painful death by his Combater Satan, was the main cause of his exceeding natural fear, and so consequently of his Agony: But,

Secondly, in order to overcome that fear, the Dialogue doth make his godly fear in his rational soul by putting up strong prayers, with cryes and tears, for the overcoming of his natural fear, to be another ground that did increase his violent sweat in his Agony.

And thirdly, It makes his pious care to perform all the sufferings that were written of him, in exact obedience in all circumstances to the Laws of the Combate, without any diversion by Satans provocations, to bee another circumstance that did aggravate his zeal in his prayers, and so it was a helping cause to increase his sweat in his Agony: But mark this, the Dialogue doth still make his natural fear of death to be the foundation of all this; and therefore I know no just cause given why Mr. *Norton* should say, That my words are a secret acknowledgement, that his fear of a natural death, was not a sufficient cause of his exceeding sorrows before his death.

Natural death is the punishment of original sin, but Christs humane nature was not by that justice subjected to death.

2 I cannot chuse but wonder that Mr. *Norton* doth so often charge the Dialogue to speak of Christs natural death only, seeing the Dialogue doth shun that word as altogether unfit to express the formality of his death, as I have shewed at Reply 5. This is a plain evidence, That Mr. *Norton* doth not understand the drift of the Dialogue about the true nature of Christs death; natural death is that bodily death which was

by Gods positive justice inflicted on fallen *Adam*, as the punishment of original sin, in *Gen.*3.19. which is now natural to us; this is a true description of natural death; But Christs humane nature, was not made subject to death by the curse of that supreme positive Law, because he was free from orginal sin, and so free from the curse of that Law, for sin is not imputed, where there is no Law, *Rom.*5.13. But by another positive Law and Covenant, wherein hee was an equal and reciprocal Covenanter. Mr. *Norton* having gone astray in his first foundation-proposition, he strayes further and further from the true nature of Christs death and sacrifice; first, he saith, That all the curses of the Law are heaped together, and laid upon Christ: And then in page 83. and in divers other places, hee strayes further and further, till hee make the death of Christ in the formality of it to be his subjection to that cursed bodily death that was inflicted on fallen *Adam* for their original sin in *Gen.*3.19. But I hope I have sufficiently shewed in Reply 3. and 5. a little before, and elsewhere, That the death of Christ was not a natural death, but a death of Covenant only, or else it could not have been a sacrifice for the procuring of Gods Attonement to the Elect, which no other mans natural death in the world is besides: And therefore the Dialogue doth rightly argue in page 6. that the death of Christ is not included in that cursed death that was threatned to fallen *Adam* in *Gen.*3.19. But it was declared to be of another nature, and exemplified to *Adam* by the death of some Lamb offered in sacrifice for the breaking of the Devils Head-plot, four verses before, namely in *Gen.*3.15.

Ainſ. doth make the earnest praye s of Christ to be a part of his Agony.

3 It is evident to all men, that his earnest prayers did increase his sweat in his Agony, by the very words of the Text in *Luke* 22.44. And saith *Ainsworth*, upon the word *Incense* [*beaten small*] in *Lev.*16.12. It figured the Agony of Christ in his prayers before his death, which hee offered up with strong crying and tears, *Luke* 22.44. *Heb.*5.7.

And saith *Trap* in *Mat.* 26.36. our Saviour prayed himself into an Agony, to teach us to strive in prayer, even to an Agony, as the word signifieth, in *Col.*4. 12. for earnest prayer is an earnest striving or wrastling it out with God,

Rom.

Rom.15.30. And so *Jacob* wrastled both bodily and spiritually with Christ for a blessing, *Gen.*32.24. *Heb.* 12.3,4. Rom.15.30. Deut. 9.14. Ex 32.10.

And saith *Aust.* in *Gen.* 32.24. *Jacob* wrestled or combated with Christ, and so *Rachel* wrastled or combated with *Leah*, Gen. 30.8. And so Christ with excellent wrastling wrastled it out with Satan; He fought the good fight and kept to the Rule of obedience in his feare and prayers; and such kind of prayers do often cause men to sweat, though they have the Spirit but by measure; how much more fervent then was Christ in his prayers in his Agony in the Garden, which had the Spirit above measure (as the Dialogue doth argue) it is no marvel then, that his prayers which were uttered with strong cryes and teares, did increase his sweat in his Agony, until it trickled down like as it were great drops of blood. Nature it self without the gracious actings of Gods Spirit, may strive it self into a sweaty Agony, as the Physician that wrote the book *de utilitate Respirationis* (among *Galens* Works, *Auribus. Tom.*7.) saith, It sometimes happeneth, that fervent spirits do so dilate the pores of the body that blood passeth by them, and so the sweat may be bloody: Hence I reason thus; If a natural man may bee thus fervent in spirits till his sweat may bee bloody; then why might not Christ, that had his natural fervency increased in his prayers by the Spirit above measure, provoke a bloody sweat from his body? and therefore the reasoning of the Dialogue is sound and good, which runs; If the natural fear of death, and the striving of the Spirit in prayer may cause men to sweat, then it might cause our Saviours pure humane nature to sweat, much more, *&c.* as it follows in the Dialogue. Also in Reply 24. you may see an example of a bloody sweat caused through the sudden fear of an ignominious death.

4 Consider how terrible to nature death is at sometimes; but at sometimes again not terrible: After our Saviour had finished his prayers in the Garden, hee said to his Disciples in *Matth.* 26.46. *Arise, let us be going*, namely, to meet that ignominious death, that a little before was so dreadful to my humane nature, that it put me into an Agony, but now I have obtained a confirmation to my nature against those fears, and therefore now I say unto you, *Arise, let us go meet it*: Which till he had prayed (saith *Trap*) he greatly feared: And saith Dr. *Hall*, the fear of death is natural, and so far from being evil, that it was in- Mat.26.46. See Dr. Hall in his Select Thoughts, p. 139.

incident to the Son of God, who was heard in that which hee feared.

Observe, I pray, That Dr. *Hall* doth speak this of Christs natural fear of his bodily death.

And secondly, This also is worthy of due observation, that Christ must overcome his natural fear of death before hee could make his vital soul a sacrifice, according to Gods command, for it was Gods command, and his own Covenant also, that he should not suffer any to take away his vital soul from him.

But secondly, to lay it down of himself, namely, as a sacrifice, by his own will, desire, and power; but this his humane nature could not do, until hee had overcome his natural fear; and he had no better way to overcome his natural fear, than by his fervent wrastling prayers, as it is expressed in *Luke* 22.44. and *Heb.*5.7. Hee might not in this case use the power of his Godhead to make his nature impassible, because hee had covenanted to enter the Lists with his Combater Satan, in the infirmities of our humane nature, and he had no better way to get a confirmation (like Armor of proof) to his humane nature against this fear of his unnatural ignominious death; than by his earnest sweating prayers, in which he was heard, because of his godly fear.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 87.

A true description of Christs Agony. Luk.22.44.

The word Agony in Luke 22.44. *signifies the sorrows of Combaters entring the Lists, with the sense of the utmost danger of life. A metaphor taken from the Passion of conflicting affections, in the greatest, eminentest, and most sensible perils, and so holding forth the sharpest of the fears of men.*

Reply 21. This description of the word Agony, I do acknowledge to bee very true and good: But in his explication of it to Christ, he doth again spoyl it, because hee makes the Agony of Christ to be his conflicting with his Fathers vindicative wrath, and with eternal death, whereas according to the true sense of Scripture: It was his natural fear conflicting with

with his ignominious torturing death, which (by his own Covenant with his Father) he was to suffer from his combater Satan; and in that respect he also covenanted, that his true humane nature which he would assume from the seed of the deceived sinful woman, should be eminently touched with the dread of his cruel and ignominious usage, according to the true purport of Gods first declaration in *Gen.*3.15.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in p.87.

Luke expresseth the nature of his passion in general by an Agony, in Luk.22.44.

*Reply.*22. I grant it was an Agony in general, but not from his sufferings from Gods immediate wrath, as Mr. *Norton* holds, but from his sufferings from the malice of his Combater Satan: and for the better understanding of the true nature of his agony, I will ranck it into two sorts.

First, Into his active agony in the Garden.

Secondly, Into his passive agony, or rather into his active-passive agony, from the time of his apprehension to his death on the crost.

1 I will speak of his active agony; and that was begun in some degree before his last Supper, as it is evident by *Joh.*12.27. with *Joh.*13.1. *Now is my soul troubled, and what shall I say? Father save me from this hour*, namely, from the dread of this hour (but not absolutely from the hour of his sufferings, as the next words do evidence) but (saith he) *for this cause came I to this hour.* And though it is said by a * passive verb, *my soul is troubled*, yet in *Joh.*11.33. he is said to trouble himself. Joh. 12.27.

* Sometimes the passive verb is put for the active. See *Ainsw.* in Deut.31.17. and in *Paraus* reconciling the Greek in Rom.4.3. with the Hebrew in Gen.15.6. he saith, these two are all one, God imputed Faith, and Faith by God was imputed; so also, he poured out his soul to death, *Isa.*53.12. is in the Seventy, and in Rom.4.25. he was delivered to death. And saith *Ball* on the Covenant, p.60. Active verbs are expounded passively among the Hebrews. See also *Ainsw.* in Psa 36.3. & 109.13. & 40 15. & 122.5. Gen.20.6. Lev.26.2,11.

And hence it follows by these two Scriptures compared, that his conflicting affections were active; for his sensitive will was in an absolute subjection to his rational will, in which he was the absolute Lord Commander of all his affections, they did his will at his beck; and this excellent property belongs onely to the humane nature of Christ, it is his personal priviledge; for our natural passions in him were above our natural power, because nature in him did never go before his will, as *Damascen* speaks in Reply 26.

2 The thought of his sufferings was much in his mind when he was at his last Supper; and therefore while he was at Supper he bad *Judas* to do what he had to do quickly, *Joh.* 13. 27. and when *Judas* was gone about his treachery, he did manifest that he had very sad apprehensions of what evils he was to suffer; for Supper being ended, and Jesus knowing that the father had given all things into his hands, *Joh.* 13. 3. namely, knowing that the Father had given the management of the whole combate into the hands of his true humane nature, as it was accompanied with true humane passions, he knew it was his duty to stir up his true humane conflicting affections, in a more eminent manner than other men, at the approach of his ignominious and painful sufferings, according to the most eminent and tender constitution of his nature, above the nature of other men.

3 It is also evident, that the expressions of the two Evangelists, *Matthew* and *Mark*, do relate to the same agony that *Luke* doth: and therefore *Tindal* doth translate [*Ademonith*] *Mat.* 26.37. and in *Mark*, 14.33. (which we translate very heavy) by the word *Agony* in both places, just as he doth [*Agon*] in *Luk.* 22.44. But as soon as Christ had obtained a confirmation against his said natural fear, by his earnest prayers in the Garden, then his inward agony by his conflicting affections had an end; I say, after he had by his earnest prayers obtained a confirmation, he never had any more conflicting affections in the consideration of those evils he was to suffer, as he had before he had prayed, as I have formerly noted it: But as soon as he had obtained his request by his earnest prayers, then he came to his Disciples and said to them (as a resolved Champion) *Come, the hour is come, Behold the Son of man is betrayed into the hands*

hands of sinners. Rise up, let us go, *Mark.* 14.41,42. namely, let us not rise up to run away through fear, but let us go and meet those arch-instruments of Satan, the sons of *Belial*, as *Ainsw.* calls them, in *Gen.* 13.13. or as *Trap* saith in *Matth.* 26.46. Rise, let us be going to meet that death, which till he had prayed (saith he) he greatly feared; Or, let us go meet my Combater Satan. He speaks these words after the manner of a couragious Champion that is going to strive with his Antagonist for the mastery; and the sequel shows that from this time forwards he resisted his Combater Satan unto blood; for it was counted a shame for such as undertook to be Combaters, to yeeld before any blood was drawn; and indeed such combats as were undertaken for the tryal of the mastery, were seldom determined without blood. And accordingly he that did overcome his Antagonist without transgressing the voluntary Laws of the Combat, was reputed by the Masters of the game to be a lawful victor, and he did thereby merit the prize; and unto this custom the Apostle doth allude in *Heb.* 12. 1,2,3. Ye have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin. Look therefore unto the example of that Combater, Jesus Christ, who is the Captain and conservator (as *Ainsw.* renders the word in *Lev.* 8.22.) of our Faith, *Who for the joy that was set before him, indured the cross, and despised the shame, and is now seated* (with honor as a conqueror) *at the right hand of the Throne of God*; for he indured (as the godly many times do) a great combate or fight of afflictions, *Heb.* 10.32.

Mar. 14.41,42.

Heb. 12. 1,2,3.

Such voluntary Laws and Covenants, as were usually made by the Masters of the Olympick, and *Roman* Combates, and such voluntary Combaters as did consent to obey the said Laws and Covenants, do somewhat exemplifie my meaning, when I do so often speak of the voluntary Covenant between the Trinity, and of the voluntary undertaking of the seed of the woman, to enter the Lists, and to combate with the arch-enemy of mankind, in obedience to those positive Laws and Covenants that were made between the Trinity for winning the prize of mans redemption.

4 An agony may be either inward, by conflicting affections against the fear of evil; and such was Christs agony in the Garden, from the fore-sight, or fore-apprehension of his igno-

ignominious usage by his cruel Combater Satan.

Or secondly, An agony may be outward, in conflicting with the smarting sense of the blows of the opposite Champion.

2 Tim.4.7,8. Dr. *Hammon* in 2 *Tim.*4.7,8. saith, That these two verses are wholly *Agonistical*, ἀγὼν (saith he) is any of the four famous Games Olympick, &c. And (of that) as it signifies the

1 Thes.2.2. suffering afflictions, See 1 *Thes.*2.6. and there (saith he) the word ἀγὼν, strife or contention, may be taken in an active or in a passive sense, *i.e.* either for labor or sufferance, both in a high degree.

In the first sense (saith he) Christ doth command us to enter in at the strait gate. And in the latter sense (saith he) see

Phil. 1.30. Col 1.29. *Heb.*12.1,2. *Phil.*1.30. *Col.*1.29. where striving is bearing or

1 Tim.4.10. suffering afflictions, and so in 1 *Tim.* 4.10. there the *K.M.* reads we combate, *i. e.* suffer persecutions, and there is the

Heb.10.32. Phil.4.3. combate of sufferings in *Heb.*10.32. and *Phil.*4.3. the women that combated or contended, *i.e.* that suffered persecutions with me.

See more of the Agonistical Games in his Annotations on

1 Cor.9.24,25, 26,27. 1 *Cor.*9.24,25,26,27. And see *Goodwin* in his *Roman Antiquities*, l.2. p.100,101,103,104. of the several sorts of combating, and he concludes with a reference to *Lipsius*, who treateth largely of the combate of Fencing.

Dan.6.14. And into this double kind of agony did *Darius* cast himself in *Dan.*6.14. *He labored till the going down of the Sun to deliver* Daniel. The Seventy translate this word *labored*, by *Agonizomenos*; that is to say, he labored as those that strive or contend for the mastery, with *Daniels* opposite Combaters, to deliver *Daniel* from the Lions Den; He so contended with *Daniels* adversaries, as he did agonize himself to deliver him, till the going down of the Sun; and this agony of his was not onely extended to his outward laboring with *Daniels* adversaries to get a Release of the Decree, but it was also an inward agony with his own conflicting affections of sorrow and fear, for the cruel death of his dearly beloved *Daniel*: And yet in vers.16. he had some hope that God would miraculously deliver *Daniel*, and when the King sealed the stone with his signet, that the Decree should not be changed, he had some hope of his escape, for he knew that the Lions did not presently seize upon his body, and there-

therefore after hee was returned to his Palace, hee remained fasting, and suffered no instruments of musick to bee brought before him, and his sleep went from him, vers. 18. all this doth evidence the greatness of his inward agony with his own conflicting thoughts and affections, of fear and sorrow, for the great danger of *Daniels* life.

These, and such like instances, do somewhat direct us how to understand the true ground and cause of Christs agony; both of his internal agony in his sensitive soul in the Garden, and of his external agony by his combate of sufferings from Satan and his instruments, from his apprehension to his death on the Cross; and how he was to conquer them by his constant patience, and by his perseverance in all obedience to the positive Laws of the combate, before he could make his soul an acceptable sacrifice.

5 I will yet more largely open Christs agony, by opening the plot of the Trinity for mans redemption, as it is declared in *Gen.* 3. 15. First, In proclaiming enmity between the seed of the Serpent, and the seed of the Woman. Gen. 3. 15.

And secondly, In declaring the victory to go on Christs side by his obedience to the Laws of the Combate, even when the Devil by his malicious stratagems should peirce him in the foot-soals.

1. God told the Devil in the Serpent, in *Gen.* 3. 15. that he would put an utter enmity between him and the seed of the deceived woman; and that he should have his full liberty to use him as a sinful Malefactor, and (at last) to peirce him in the foot-soals, and that hee should have his full liberty to enter the Lists, and try masteries with his humane nature, as it was accompanied with our true natural infirmities, to the end that he might try the best of skill, if by any means he could bring this seed of the woman into any disobedience to the Laws of the Combate, as he had done with *Adam* in his Innocency.

But Mr. *Norton* in page 19. and in page 218. doth spoyl the true sense of this word, Seed of the woman, (called *Hee*, and *Him*) in *Gen.* 3. 15. by interpreting it in a collective sense of Christ, and his members; whereas it should bee interpreted only of the individual person of Christ, as he is the second *Adam*, and publick head of his Elect Church; as Mr. *Rutherford* on the

Covenant, page 312. hath rightly expounded the word Seed, in *Gal.* 3.16. and his reasons there alleged may serve to prove the like sense of the word Seed, in *Gen.* 3.15.

Moreover God told the Devil, that hee might look to himself as well as hee could, that this seed of the deceived woman, should by his perfect obedience to the Laws of the Combate, conquer him in all his designs, and at last make his soul a most perfect obedient sacrifice; by which perfection of his obedience, both in his Combate and Sacrifice, he should break in peeces his first grand Head-plot; for his first grand Head-plot was to intice *Adam* to eat the forbidden fruit (contrary to Gods voluntary positive prohibition) and thereby to intwrap him, and all his natural posterity into the same spiritual death of original sin: But yet for all this, God told the Devil, that hee would raise up a seed from this deceived sinful woman, that should conquer him by his most perfect and exact obedience to another voluntary positive Law, that should be more hard and difficult to be performed than *Adams* was by infinite degrees, and that was first to enter the Lists with Satan and his Instruments, and not to bee disturbed in his patience, but to observe the laws of the Combate in all obedience, and at last (when the Devil had done his worst) he should then make his vital soul a sacrifice in breathing out his immortal soul by his own Priestly power; and all this is comprehended in this sentence, *Hee shall break thy head*: and by this speech, God did fully forewarn the Devil, that he might use his best skill without any restraint, to do what he could to disturb the patience of this seed of the woman, either by his sinful imputations, or by his ignominious usage, or by his cruel tortures, and so might do his utmost to interrupt his obedience, that so his death might not be a sacrifice, and that so by this means he might save his Head-plot from being broken, and accordingly the Devil did often stir up his Arch-instruments to disturb his patience, but especially when he entred into *Judas* to fetch a band of armed men with swords and staves to apprehend him as a notorious Malefactor, and stirred up the Scribes to accuse him as a most sinful Malefactor, worse than the murtherer *Barabas*, and he stirred up *Herod*, and his Souldiers, to mock him, and *Pilate* to condemn him to the most shameful cursed death of the Cross;

Cross; and all this evil usage is included in this sentence, *This* (Satan) *shall prince him to the foot-stool.*

And in this Combate this is chiefly to be marked, That the Devil did use all the foulest play that hee could devise to disturb the patience of this Seed of the woman that was compassed about with our true natural affections and passions, and with a tender sense of every evil, for the Devil knew that if he could by all his foul play, but once have disturbed his patience, that then he had perverted him in the course of his obedience, and then hee knew that hee should have spoyled his death from being a sacrifice, and then he knew that hee should have preserved the first grand Head-plot from being broken; and then the Devil would have triumphed over Christ upon the Cross, and over all mankind, as he did when he first brought *Adam* to disobey Gods positive prohibition in eating the forbidden fruit.

God was pleased further to declare, That it was the plot of the Trinity, that the second person should take into him the seed of the deceived sinful woman; and that he should enter the Lists with his enemy Satan, in that nature, as it was accompanied with true natural passions, and not in the power of his divine nature, and therefore it was of necessity that he must meet the touch of his humane nature by his true natural affections and passions, in fearing, and sorrowing, and abhorring his vile ignominious usage by his Combater Satan; and if it be marked, Christ doth as much complain of his shameful usage, as of his painful usage; and that he saith in *Psal.* 69. 20. *Reproach hath broken my heart*; and yet still, that notwithstanding all Satans vilde usage, hee should continue obedient to the very last, even to the most shameful death of the Cross, and that hee should then make his vital soul a sacrifice of Redemption and Reconciliation for all the Elect. And thus as by the demerit of *Adams* disobedience to a meer positive Law, *The Many* (even the Elect as well as the Reprobate) were made sinners, so by the merit of the obedience of the second *Adam* to Gods meer positive Law in his combate with Satan, and in his death and sacrifice, *The Many are made righteous*, Rom. 5. 18, 19. that is to say, Rom 5. 18, 19. They are justified from the condemning power of sin by Gods Reconciliation for the sake of Christs obedience in his

his combate of sufferings, and in his death and sacrifice.

And indeed how else could his humane nature be better proved and exemplified, than by his fear and heavinesse at the nigh approach of his ignominious and most cruel unnatural death? and how else could his obedience be better proved and exemplified to be most perfect, than by his most perfect patience under such an ignominious and cruel usage, and therefore by his constancy in his patience and obedience through the whole combate with Satan, he got the victory over Satan, and won the prize that was set before him, by the Masters of the combate, *Phil.* 2. 8, 9. and this God declared first in *Gen.* 3. 15. *He shall break thy head-piece*, In these words God declared that the seed of the woman should be a victorious combater, and conqueror of his enemy Satan, by his patience and obedience through the whole combate; And that Christs sufferings are set out by his combater Satan, it is the Scripture phrase and language by which Christs sufferings and his victory is described and deciphered, as it is evident by *Gen.* 3. 15. and so in like sort by *Heb.* 2. 10. he is there called the Captain of our salvation, and it is there said, that it became God to consecrate him, or to make him perfect (as he is our Captain in the combate) through his victorious sufferings from his combater Satan; and see also *Exod.* 32. 29. And Christ is called our Captain, because all good Christians are called his Souldiers, 2 *Tim.* 2. 3, 4. And therefore in *Col.* 2. 15. Christ is said to have spoiled Principalities and powers, and (as a conqueror) to make a shew of them openly, and to triumph over them in it, namely, in his patient and obedient death on the cross; and he is also compared to a victorious shepherd that ventures his life to combate with the fierce Lion and the ravenous Bear, to redeem the poor Lamb from his prey (as *David* did) in *Joh.* 13. 11. and in *Isa.* 53. 12. He is said to divide the spoyl with the strong, because he poured out his soul to the death, namely, because he ventured his life with his combater Satan, and because at last when he had fulfilled all his sufferings, he powred out his vital soul to the death, in the nature of a sacrifice, when he said, *Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.* And therefore saith God, He shall divide the spoil with the strong adversary Satan, for though Satan at the first got the victory over *Adam*, and thereby inwrapped all mankind

Phil. 2. 8, 9. Gen. 3. 15. Heb. 2. 10. All Christs greatest sufferings were by Gods appointment to bee from his combater Satan, as in Reply 12. and 6.

Col 2. 15.

Isa 53. 12. Joh. 10. 11.

mankind, under his power, as his spoil; yet now at the last Christ by his constant patience and obedience, notwithstanding all Satans provocations, hath got the victory again over Satan, and by that means he pacified Gods wrath for the Elect, and rescued them from being Satans spoil, to be his spoil. And thus you see how Christ hath divided the spoil, as *David* did when he conquered the *Amalekites*, 1 *Sam.* 30. and this dividing of the spoyl is always done with joy for the victory, as in *Judg.* 5. 30. *Luk.* 11. 22.

These and such like Scriptures do fully declare unto us wherein the true nature of Christs agony doth consist, namely, in his combate with his ignominious answer from his malicious combater Satan, both his inward agony in the Garden, when he was surrounded with great fear, and with great heavines, it was in relation to his outward agony by his combate of sufferings from Satan on the cross; and also the true nature of his conquest is set out by that victorious weapon of righteousnes, his constant and exact patience and obedience, and no Scripture doth mention his sufferings to be from Gods Judgement seat, in the way of legal proceedings from Gods immediate wrath, though the Devil took that course to make him a legal sinner before *Pilats* judgement seat.

3 The Devil having had this open warning by Gods proclamation of an utter enmity, namely, that the seed of the woman should by his patience and obedience under all the difficulties of the combate, break his head-plot; he took the warning, and therefore he neglected no time, but took the very first opportunity to disturb the patience, and to spoil the obedience of the seed of the woman, even as soon as ever he was intrinsecally installed into the Mediators Office (which was done at his baptism) and then Christ also was led by the Spirit of God (that annointed him, and installed him with gifts for his Office) into the wilderness on purpose to try Masteries with the Devil; and there the Devil continued to tempt him by all the sleights he could devise for forty daies together, and because he could not prevail in those forty days, therefore when the said forty days were ended, he grew to be more desperate (than formerly) in his temptations, and according to the grant of his power (which was unlimited) over the body of

Christ, he took it up, and carried it aloft to the Air, and set it upon the top of the Pinacle of the Temple; and truly, it is no marvel that the Divine nature would suffer his Humane nature to be carried about by the Devil, seeing he suffered his humane nature to be crucified by him. But still the Devil lost his labor, because Christs obedience was unconquerable, for by his patience and obedience he resisted the Devil in all his temptations; and after the Devil had spent his skill in these three notable temptations, he is said to leave him for a season, *Luk.*4.14. but it was but for a short season, for in vers. 16. when our Savior came to *Nazaret* where he had been brought up, he went into the Synagogue on the Sabbath day, and stood up to read; and at last he said thus to them, *No Prophet is accepted in his own Country*, vers. 24. *And then all in the Synagogue when they heard these things were filled with wrath* (for the Devil did now provoke their corrupt natures thereto) *and they rose up and thrust him out of the City, and led him to the brow of the hill, that they might cast him down headlong*, vers. 28, 29. and ever after continually the Devil did nothing else but raise up most vild slanderous accusations against him, and often moved the Pharisees to take him and put him to death.

Satan did first enter the Lists with Christ at his baptism, when he was first extrinsecally installed into the Mediators office though more especially in the Garden and on the Cross.

4 The Devil did yet more eagerly enter the lists with Christ, at his last Supper, and so on to the Garden; for at his last supper he said thus to his Disciples, *Hereafter I will not talk much with you, for the Prince of this world commeth*, *Joh.*14.30. For just now he hath taken away *Judas* from our society to fetch a Band of armed men from the High-Priests to apprehend me as a sinful malefactor; and therefore I fore-tel you that the Prince of this world commeth now to assault me more fiercely than ever heretofore, So that hereafter I cannot talk much with you, as now I do. Of which more hereafter.

Joh. 14.30.

But because Mr. *Norton* doth make this Agony of Christ to be his conflicting passions with his Fathers vindicative wrath; therefore it is needful ere we go any further to examine such Scriptures as are brought for the proof of it.

1. The first Scripture I will begin with, is in *Mat.*26.37. This Scripture hath been objected to me by some of note, to prove that

Matth. 26.37.

that God himself did smite Christ the Shepherd of the sheep, by his immediate vindicative wrath.

The context lies thus, When Christ was at Supper with his Disciples, his true humane nature was much exercised with the thought of his ignominious and cruel usage, which Satan was ready to bring upon him; as it appears by his speeches to his Disciples, *All ye* (said he) *shall be offended because of me this night: For it is written, I will smite the Shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered, Matth.26.31.* This [*I*] hath been expounded to me by some of note, to be God, and so it is; but withall they expound it to be Gods smiting of Christs soul with his immediate wrath. But this I deny, for these words must be expounded from *Zach.* 13. 7. and then the case will be altered, for the words in *Zachary* runs thus, *Smite thou the shepherd*, there the word [*Thou,*] is put for the word [*I*] in *Matthew*, and this difference is observed by Mr. *Ainsworth* in his preface to *Genesis*; so that in *Zachary* God saith to Satan, *smite thou the Shepherd*; Smite him as a sinful malefactor and spare not, do thy worst to disturb his patience,&c. God speaks thus to Satan in *Zachary*, just as he did in *Gen.* 3.15. Thou Satan shalt peirce the seed of the woman in the foot-soals as a wicked malefactor. Zach. 13.7.

Weigh the whole Text in Zachary, *which runs thus.*

Awake, O Sword, against my Shepherd; That is to say, rouse up thy self O Satan, and bring a band of men armed with swords and staves against my shepherd, *and against the man that is my fellow*, as we see he did in *Mat.*26.47. *Smite thou the shepherd*, for I have given thee full liberty without any restraint, to use thy best skill to make him a sinful malefactor, and to smite him as a sinful malefactor, that thou mayst disturb his patience if thou canst, and so mayst make him a transgressor, as thou didst *Adam*. Or it may be read as it is in *Matthew*, *I will smite the shepherd*; For I God have given Satan full liberty to smite him, that I may see the proof of his patience and obedience.

And in this form of speech God is said to afflict *Job*, and

therefore *Job* said, *The Lord hath taken away my cattle, and my children*, Job 1. In these words you see that *Job* ascribes all the evils that fell upon him, to God, because God permitted Satan to do what he did, and therefore saith *Job*, in Chap.19.21. *The hand of God hath touched me*; In these words he called the Devil Gods hand, because God gave the Devil leave to afflict him (so as he did) to try his patience, and we see that *Jobs* patience in his first encounter with Satan was not disturbed. And in this sense the word [*I*] must be understood in *Matthew*; *I will smite the shepherd*; that is to say, I God will give Satan leave to smite the shepherd. This is the true sense of *Matthew*, and therefore this is no proof that God smote Christs soul from his immediate vindicative wrath.

Isa. 53.10. The second Scripture to be examined is *Isa.*53.10. *It pleased the Lord to bruise him, and to put him to grief, when he shall set out, or give his soul to be a Trespass-Offering*, or as the Seventy read it, *a sin*, For this phrase *set*, see *Ainsw.* on *Gen.*21.13. & 27.37. and in *Psa.*8.2. *and Gen.*9.12. & 17.5.

This Scripture being rightly interpreted, doth not mean that God was pleased to bruise Christ actively, and so to put him to grief by his immediate wrath; But it means that it pleased the Lord passively to put, that is to permit and suffer Satan to bruise him, and to put him to grief, and so speaks our larger Annotation on these words, *He put him to grief*, or (as some saith the Annotation) he suffered him to be put to pain or torment, because this form (saith the Annotation) hath oft in it a notion of permission, as in *Psal.*37.33. *Psal.*119.10,116. and *Isa.*63.17. and see more for this form in Reply 22. and in *Ainsw.* in *Psa.*39.9. and in *Psa.*16.10.

In this sense, I say, It pleased the Lord to bruise Christ, and to put him to grief, and just so it pleased the Lord to put an utter enmity between the Devil and the seed of the deceived sinful woman, in *Gen.*3.15. there the Lord appointed the Devil by his permissive Commission to combate for the victory with the seed of the woman; and in case the Devil could prevail to disturb his patience, then the Victory was to go on his side, but

Gen.3.15.

in

in case the seed of the woman did persevere in his patience and obedience through all the Devils ignominious trials, and at last in that perfect obedience did make his vital soul a Sacrifice by breathing out his immortal soul by his own Priestly power, then the victory was to go on his side, and then hee was to have the prize, namely, the Redemption of all the Elect.

And in this sense also is *Isa.*53.5. to bee understood, *He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities*: God may be said to do this (though not from his immediate wrath) because he permitted Satan to do all this, as I have expounded these words formerly. Isa. 53.5.

And in this sense it is said in *Psal.*69.27. *They persecuted him whom thou hast smitten*: God is here said to smite Christ, but yet not from his immediate wrath, but by Satan and his Instruments, God permitted Satan to do his worst to Christ, to manifest the perfection of his obedience for his Priestly consecration to his sacrifice; but the Devils end was to disturb his patience, and so to pervert him in his obedience, that so his death might not be a sacrifice.

And thus it pleased the Lord to bruise him, and put him to grief, namely, by Satan and his Instruments, and not by Gods immediate wrath; And this I beleeve is the plain genuine sense of *Isaiah*.

And because I judge this interpretation to bee of necessary consequence, I will once more repeat it with some inlargement.

It pleased the Lord, according to the counsel of his own will (which hee first declared to us in *Gen.*3.15.) to permit Satan to enter the Lists with the seed of the deceived woman, to deceive him if he could; and to that end he gave him his full liberty to deceive him by fraud, or to provoke him by force to some sinful disturbance or other: And thus it pleased the Lord to permit Satan to bruise him, and to put him to grief, by an ignominious and long lingring violent death, to disturb his patience and obedience if hee could, even at the same time, when his soul shall set, or give it self to bee a Trespass-offering, that so hee might spoyl his death from being a sacrifice if he could, and thereby might save his first grand Head-plot from being;

being broken: And it pleased the Lord also according to the counsel of his own will, to Covenant to, and with the Mediator, that in case he held constant in his obedience, through all Satans malicious stratagems, and at last in that perfect obedience did give his soul to be a Trespasse-offering, then his obedience in his said sufferings should be for his perfect consecration, and then his death should be accepted as an acceptable sacrifice of Reconciliation for all the Elect, and then Gods Covenant with him was that hee should see his seed, and prolong his dayes, and that the pleasure of the Lord for mans actual Regeneration, and Reconciliation, should prosper in his hands.

But Mr. *Norton* doth often torment this heavenly sense of *Isaiah*, with a contrary, for hee makes Christ to combate with Gods immediate wrath, and to suffer as a legal sinner, and as our legal Surety from the judicial vindicative wrath of God, even from his judicial vindicative Judgement-seat, as in page 55,63,85,122,143,165,192,213,39, &c.

The third Scripture to bee examined is *Rom.*8.32. *God spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all.*

Hence Mr. *Norton* infers in page 122. *That Christ was tormented without any forgiveness; God (saith he) spared him nothing of the due debt*, Rom.8.32.

Rom 8.32.

To this interpretation I Reply; That Gods not sparing his Son, but delivering him up for us all, must not bee understood of Gods delivering him up to his own immediate wrath, as Mr. *Nortons* sense doth carry it: But of Gods delivering him up to his Combater Satan, that so Satan might have his full liberty to do his worst unto him to provoke his patience, and so to pervert him in his obedience by his ignominious and cruel usage, that so he might spoyl his death from being a sacrifice if he could, and that so hee might hinder him from breaking his first grand Head-plot: In this sense God spared not his Son, but gave him up for us all, and in this sense, God gave Satan liberty to use *Pilate* as his instrument to make Christ bear our sins in his body on the Tree, 1 *Pet.*2.24. And therefore Christ

Christ said unto *Pilate*, *Thou couldest have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above*, Joh.19.11. For God gave Satan leave to do his worst against Christ, by all the wicked instruments he thought fit to imploy; And Mr. *Norton*s sense, that God delivered up Christ to be tormented by his own immediate wrath is confounded also by *Peters* expofition in *Act*.2. 23,24.

The fourth Scripture to bee examined is *Act*.2.23,24. and *Act*. 4. 27, 28.

Him being delivered (saith *Peter*) *by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, Yee* (the Devils Arch-instruments) *have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain, whom God hath raised up, having loosed the paines of death.*

Hence it is questioned what paines of death they were that God did loose?

The Answer is, Not paines of the second death, as some do most unadvisedly expound it. But those paines of death, *Which Yee by wicked hands have made by crucifying and slaying his body on the Tree*; These are the paines of death that were made by the wicked hands of his Crucifiers, and these paines of death were they that God looſed and healed at his Resurrection.

And these wicked hands are thus described in *Isa*.53.8,9. *Hee was taken away by distresse* (or restraint) *and by judgement, and who shall declare his Generation?* Isa.53.8,9.

Namely, Who shall bee able to declare the extreme wickedness of that Satanical generation, by whose wicked hands hee was taken away as a wicked Malefactor, and restrained of his wonted liberty, and brought as a Malefactor before the judgement-seat of the High-priest, and of *Pilate*, and of *Herod*, and again before the judgement-seat of *Pilate*, where hee was sentenced to be crucified.

First, Some, I conceive, understand this Interrogation of his God-head, *Who shall declare the Generation of his Godhead?*

Secondly,

Secondly, Others understand it of the Generation of his elect number.

Thirdly, But I beleeve it must bee understood of his wicked Satanical Generation, for *John Baptist* did call them, *A generation of Vipers*, Mat.3. And Christ did call them, *A wicked and adulterous Generation*, in *Mat.*12.34,39. And so Dr. *De Beate* doth expound *Isa.* 53. 8. And so Dr. *Hammon* doth expound *Act.* 8.33. And History doth report, That at this time the Priests and Scribes were exceedingly addicted to converse familiarly with the Devil.

And then it follows in verse 8. *For he was cut off out of the land of the living*, which is thus expounded in *Act.*8.33. *His life was taken from the earth.*

And just according to this phrase *Daniel* saith, *That after sixty two weeks, the Messiah shall be cut off*; that is to say, Hee shall bee executed by the Devils Instruments for a wicked Malefactor, *Dan.*9.26. *But not for himself*, saith *Daniel*, that is to say, Not for his own sinful nature, nor for his sinful life: And to these two Scriptures do the words of Christ allude, when hee said to his Disciples at his last Supper, *The Prince of this world cometh* (with a band of armed souldiers to apprehend mee for a Malefactor) *but he hath nothing in me*, Joh.1430. no original corruption, nor no actual transgression against the laws of the Combate.

Joh.14.30.

Why then was he taken by wicked hands?

God doth answer by *Isa.*53.8. *For the transgression of my people was hee stricken, wounded and bruised on the Cross*: God would have his obedience declared to be perfected by this means, before he would accept his death as a sacrifice of Satisfaction and Reconciliation *for the transgression of his people*; and then it follows in verse 9. *That he made his grave with the wicked*; This *Mark* expounds thus, *Hee was numbred with the wicked, Mar.*15.28. *and with the rich in his death*, for he was buried in rich *Josephs* Sepulchre.

These Scriptures thus expounded, and many such like which might be alleged, must have the same sense, namely, according to Gods first declaration in *Gen.*3.15. which will eminently shew, how God is said to do all the afflictions of Christ, namely, (not from his immediate wrath, but) because according

ding to the voluntary Covenans and Council of the blessed Trinity, he proclaimed a combate of enmity between Satan, the arch-enemy of mankind, and the seed of the deceived woman.

And secondly, Because he gave the Devil a commission to do his worst to disturb his patience, and so to pervert his obedience.

3 God may be said to do all the soul-sufferings of Christ, because he appointed him to take on him the seed of the woman, and mans true natural affections and passions, and so to be inwardly touched with the sence of Satans ignominious and unnatural usage, and to manifest it to his Disciples in a high degree, according to the most excellent temper and tender constitution of his nature above ours, and his obedience thereto caused his inward agony in the Garden.

4 It is further evident that God would have Christs soul to be affected with a deep degree of the dread of his ignominious and unnatural usage by Satan (even to an eminent Agony) because he appointed him to enter the Lists, and to combate with Satan in his true humane nature, as it was accompanied with his true natural infirmities of fear, &c. and not as it was sometimes accompanied with the power of his Godhead.

Christ did not enter the Lists with Satan in the glorious power of his divine nature, but in his humane nature, as it was accompanied with our true natural infirmities, dreading an ignominious death.

For by Gods declared will, Christ might not take his utmost advantage against Satan by arming his humane nature with the assistance of twelve Legions of Angel; neither might he put forth his omnipotent and absolute power to destroy or annihilate Satan, neither might he shut up Satan in his everlasting prison to hinder him from his encounter, for if Christ had put forth such a power as this against Satan, the odds had been too great, and such odds given to Christ could not stand with the wisdom of the supream Covenanters; and therefore in *Gen.* 3.15. God appointed Christ to take on him the seed of the deceived sinful woman, and in that nature to enter the Lists with Satan; by the well managing and ordering of which nature better than our first parents had done in their innocency, he should prevalle against the stratagems of the old Serpent, that had the power of death over our first parents; and doubtless

the Devil made full account to get the like power over the humane nature of Christ, as he had done over *Adams* pure nature, and to that end, he did not cease to imploy his Instruments to tempt him, and often times hee heaped upon him many grievous accusations and sinful imputations, and at last he proceeded so far as to apprehend him, condemn him, and crucifie him as a sinful malefactor; But still the deceiver was deceived, for indeed, Christ was such a wise servant; and such a faithful Priest that he circumvented Satan and all his Instruments by his righteousnes in managing the combate according to the just laws of the combate, for the Devil could not by all his stratagems prevail to make him a Transgressor, and therefore he could not prevail to put him to death formally, by forcing his vital soul out of his body by all his torments, and this is evident, because Gods Justice had not ordained any thing else but sin onely to be the sting of death; and therefore unless Satan could have so far prevailed as to make him a guilty sinner, he could not sting him to death formally; but himself was the onely Priest in the formality of his death, and therefore when he was in strength of nature he did but say, *Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit*, and then at that instant he gave up the Ghost, and that last act being done according to Covenant, gave the formality, 1. To his Obedience. 2. To his Death. 3. To his Sacrifice. And 4. To the full price of satisfaction to Gods Justice for mans redemption.

And thus the seed of the woman conquered Satan, broke his first grand Head-plot by his weapon of righteousnes, and won the prize.

5 This is no new upstart doctrine, that Christ conquered Satan by righteousnes, in observing the Laws of the combate, and by entering the Lists with the infirmities of his humane nature, which was most eminently shewed both in his internal and external agony, but this doctrine hath been taught by the antient Divines, for.

Orbo Fidei l.3. c.18. 1 Christ was made man (saith *Damasen*) that so that which was conquered might conquer; God was not unable (saith he) by his mighty force and power to take man from the Tyrant, but then that would have been a cause of complaint to the Tyrant that had conquered man, if he had been forced by (the power

power of God; therefore God who pitied and loved us, willing to make man that was fallen the conqueror of Satan, became man, restoring the like by the like.

3 *Gregory* saith, When Satan took Christs body to crucifie it, hee lost Christs Elect from the right of his power. *Homil. lib. 3. c. 21.*

Ibidem, From Gods speech to Satan concerning *Job*, *He is in thy hand, but save his life*; he doth thus declare Gods commission to Satan touching Christ; Take thou power against his body, and loose the right of thy dominion over his Elect.

3 (Saith *Irenæus*) Christ coupled and united man to God, for if man had not vanquished the enemy of man, the enemy had not been justly vanquished. *Iren. l. 3. c. 20.*

4 *Leo* saith, If the God-head onely should have opposed it self for sinners, not so much reason as power should have conquered the Devil. *De passi. Dom. Ser. 5.*

Ibidem, The son of God therefore admitted wicked hands to be laid upon him, and what the rage of persecutors offered, he with patient power suffered.

This (saith he) was the great mystery of godliness, that Christ was even loaden with injuries, which if he should have repelled with open power, he should have onely exercised his divine strength, but not regarded our cause that were men; for in all things which the madness of the people and Priests did reproachfully unto him, our sins were wiped away, and our offences purged (as *Isa.* 53. 5.) The Devil himself (saith he) did not understand that his cruelty against Christ should overthrow his Kingdom.

He should not (saith he) have lost the right of his fraud, if he could but have abstained from the Lords blood, but greedy with malice to hurt, whiles he rusheth on Christ, himself falleth; whilst he taketh, he is taken, and pursuing him that was mortal, he lighted on the Saviour of the world.

And saith he, in Ser. 10. Jesus Christ being lifted on the tree returned death on the Author of death (*Heb.* 2 14.) and strangled all the principalities and powers that were against him, by objecting his flesh that was passable, and giving place in himself to the presumption of our antient enemy, who ra-

These letters a,b,c,d, do shew that the antient Divines held no such imputation of sin to Christ, as Mr. *Norton* holds.

ging against mans nature that was subject unto him, durst there exact his debt, *where he could find no* (a) *sign of sin*; therefore the general and mortal hand-writing by which we were sold, was torn, and the contract of our captivity came into the power of the redeemer.

And (saith he) in Serm. 12. To destroy the Kingdom of the Devil, he rather used the righteousness of Reason, than the power of his Might, for whilst the Devil raged on him, whom he held *by no* (b) *Law of sin*, he lost the right of his wicked dominion. Hence I infer, If the Devil did afflict him by no Law of sin, then he was not a sinner by Gods legal imputation.

De Providen. Ser. 10,

5. *Theodoret* saith, Because thou who receivedst power against sinners hast touched my body *that am* (c) *guilty of no sin*, forfeit thy power, and cease thy Tyranny: I will free mine from death, not using simply the power of a Lord, but a righteous power: I have paid the debt of mankind; owing no death, I have suffered death; and not subject to death, and did admit death, *no way* (d) *guilty*, I was reckoned with the guilty; and being free from debt, I was numbered among the debtors; sustaining therefore an unjust death, I dissolve the death that is deserved; and imprisoned wrongfully, I free them from prison that were justly detained.

Ibidem (saith he) Let no man think that herein we dally, for by the sacred Gospels and Doctrines of the Apostles, we are taught that these things are so.

And saith *Leo, de pass. Dom. Ser.* 17. He that came to destroy death, and the author of death, how should he have saved sinners if he would have resisted his pursuers?

6 *Austin* speaks very much to this sense, That Christ overcame the Devil by justice (namely, by combating justly according to the Laws of the voluntary Covenant declared in *Gen.* 3. 15.) and not by force (namely, not by the power of his God-head) any man may see that his discourse sounds to this sense; His discourse is long, but Mr. *Wotton* hath abbreviated his method, *De Reconciliatione peccatoris, part.* 2. *lib.* 1. *c.* 21. and there he cites *Bernard* also to the same sense, and thither I refer the Reader.

7 Saith Dr. *Willet*, on *Dan.* 9. 26. the justice of Christ is meritorious

victorious over sin for us, because by it he overcame death, and subdued the Devil, none of all which *Adams* righteousnes could do.

And it was one great part of the righteousnes of Christ to agonize himself with the dread of that ignominious usage which his Combater was to inflict upon him.

And thus you see that the ancient Divines do agree, That Christs greatest sufferings were from Satans malice by Gods permission; and I perceive by conference with such as have been well read in the ancient Divines, that they did not hold as Mr. *Norton* doth, That Christ was a guilty sinner by Gods legal imputation, nor that hee was prest under the wrath of God: but on the contrary, they affirm that there was no sign of sin in him, and that the Devil held him by no law of sin, and that he was no way guilty of sin.

8 Those few Hebrew Doctors that speak of the death of the Messiah, do speak of his sufferings with his Combater Satan; as I have noted their speeches in the Epistle to the Reader.

9 The Apostle makes a like kind of reasoning in *Heb.*2.14. *For as much then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, hee also himself took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the Devil.* Heb.2.14.

Here two Questions may bee propounded, and answered.

1 *How came the Devil to get the power of death?*

2 *How came his power to be destroyed?*

To the first Question, the *Geneva* Note doth answer, because he was the author of sin, none but the Devil was the author of *Adams* first sin, in causing him by his deceitful reasoning to eat the forbiden fruit, which sin brought in the spiritual death of original sin.

Adams first sin caused by the Devil, was the meritorious cause of our spiritual death by original sin, and that was the meritorious cause of Gods justice in appointing a bodily death and judge-

And then secondly, The spiritual death of original sin was the meriting cause of Gods justice in denouncing a bodily death, in *Gen.*3.19. bodily death therefore was not the immediate effect of *Adams* first sin, as most Expositors do carry it (though I think they mis-it) for if bodily death had been

The Pelagians cannot be convinced, that original sin is the cause of the death of Infants, if it be granted that bodily death was the immediate effect of *Adams* first sin.

the immediate effect of *Adams* first sin, then the Pelagians cannot be convinced, that original sin is the cause of the death of Infants; for they may say, as most Expositors say, That bodily death was the immediate effect of *Adams* first sin; and then the Pelagians may still hold that the death of Infants is not the punishment of original sin traduced from their Parents.

But the Apostle doth make the death of Infants to bee the immediate effect of original sin, in *Rom.*5.12. and the Devil was the author of original sin, because it was the immediate punishment of *Adams* first sin, whereof the Devil was the author, and so consequently it occasioned God in justice to denounce not only a bodily death, to all the fallen sons of *Adam*, but also to denounce eternal death by necessary consequence to so many of the fallen sons of *Adam* as did not beleeve their Redemption by the promised Seed; for when God did first denounce a bodily death, he did at the same time implicitly denounce a judgement, as the Apostle shews in *Heb.*9.27. and to this sense of death doth *Austin* speak, *There is a first death, and a second death:* Of the first death, saith hee, there are two parts.

Heb.9.27. See *Austin* in Ser.129.

One when the sinful soul by offending departed from her Creator.

The other, whereby the soul for her punishment was excluded from the body by Gods justice.

And the second death (saith hee) is the everlasting torment of body and soul: And thus the Devil got the power of death.

The second Question is this,

How came this power of the Devil to bee destroyed?

The Answer is, by the second Person, in taking upon him the Seed of the woman in the fulness of time, and by entring the Lists according to his Covenant in that nature, as it was accompanied with our natural infirmities, of fear, sorrow, &c. and so by his constancy in obedience through all Satans conflicts he compleated his victory, and at last hee made his vital soul a propitiatory sacrifice, which was agreed and covenanted

be-

between the Trinity to be accounted for full satisfaction, for the redemption of all the Elect: And thus hee destroyed him that had the power of death.

The Devils plot was by some stratagem or other to make Christ a Transgressor, as he had made *Adam*, but because this Seed of the deceived sinful woman, continued obedient to the death, through all Satans malicious stratagems, even to the death of the Cross, and at last made his soul a sacrifice, therefore hee got the victory, and won the prize, even the salvation of all the Elect.

And thus through this kind of death, he hath destroyed him that had the power of death, that is the Devil.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 73.

Christ (in his Agony) was pressed under the sence of the wrath of God, and conflicted with eternal death.

Reply 23. This compulsary term of being pressed under the wrath of God, is no way suitable to the voluntary obedience of a voluntary Covenanter. I have shewed in Chap. 9. that the voluntary cause is never over-ruled by a supreme compulsary power: When grapes, or any other thing is pressed, it is therefore pressed to force some thing from it: Is this a fit speech to be applied to the voluntary Covenanters, and to the voluntary undertaker of obedience to the Articles of the voluntary Covenanters; Satan indeed did labour to oppress him to force him to impatiency, but not God by his immediate wrath.

And the like strange expression I find also in the Sum of Divinity set forth by *John Downame* in page 317. By reason of the guilt of our sins (saith hee) there fell upon him sorrow, trouble of mind, astonishment, and heavinesse to death, *Matth.* 26. 38. when hee was to enter the Lists, and to fight the great combate hand to hand with his angry Father.

Christ as man was not able to conflict with his Fathers wrath.

Ibidem, in page 320. hee calls the said combate, *Hand gripes with his Father*; and his suffering on the Cross, hee calls, *The main battel, fought three whole hours (with his Father) all which time tugging in the fearful dark with him, that had the power of darkenesse to hide from the eyes of the world the fire of his Fathers*

thers wrath, which in that but skirmish, burnt up every part of him.

Just.l.2.c.16. Sect.21. And saith *Calvin*, Wee see that Christ was thrown down so far that by inforcement of distress, hee was compelled to cry out, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me.*

And thus instead of entring the Lists with the Devil, according to *Gen.*3.15. he saith, He entred the Lists to fight the great combate hand to hand with his angry Father; and instead of the Devils wrath, they put in Gods wrath; and instead of the Devils force, they put in Gods force to compel the humane nature of Christ to suffer his immediate wrath: And let the Reader take notice of this word Compelled, most unadvisedly used by *Calvin*, and others.

And now let the judicious Reader judge whether such descriptions of our Saviours Agony, be sutable to the language of the holy Scriptures, whether he was pressed and compelled by Gods immediate wrath: And whether his Agony and Conflict were not rather from the pressure and compulsion of the Devil, and his instruments, according to Gods declared Decree, in *Gen.*3.15. and judge if it bee not utterly unlike that the humane nature of Christ, as it was accompanied with our infirmities was able to enter the Lists with his angry Father, and to be pressed under his wrath, and to conflict with eternal death, as Mr. *Nortons* phrases are, was his humane nature which was left by his divine nature on purpose, that his humane infirmities might appear able to fight it out three whole hours on the Cross with his angry Father? Perhaps you will answer, hee was able, because his humane nature subsisted in his divine: I grant that it alwayes subsisted in the divine, because the divine nature was never angry with the humane; but yet it doth not follow, that it was alwayes assisted and protected by the divine, for then it could not have suffered any thing at all from Satan, and his instruments: I find it to be an ancient orthodox Tenent, that the divine nature did often put forth a power to withdraw protection and assistance from his humane, that the infirmities of the humane might appear; and in this sense his infirmities in his sufferings were admitted by his divine power: But let it be as the objection would have it, namely, that his humane nature being assisted by his divine, was able

to

to indure to bee prefſed under his Fathers wrath. Then it will follow from thence, that his divine nature did aſſiſt his humane nature againſt the divine? Is this abſurd language good Scripture-logick?

But ſaith Mr. *Norton* in p. 123.

The divine nature was angry, not onely with the humane nature, but with the perſon of the Mediator, becauſe of ſin imputed to him.

Reply 23. Firſt, I have ſhewed in p. 101. from Mr. *Burges* that ſin was not imputed to the Mediator in both his Natures.

Secondly, Was it ever heard that a Mediator, between two at variance, did fight hand to hand with the ſtronger angry oppoſite party to force him to a reconciliation? Can any reconciliation be made whiles diſpleaſure is taken, and whiles anger is kindled againſt the Mediator that ſeeks to make reconciliation? Theſe are paradoxes in Divinity, by which the clear Truth is made obſcure. Such Tenents are like the ſmoak of the bottomleſs pit, that darkens the Sun and Air of the bleſſed Scriptures. The Lord in mercy open our eyes to ſee better.

But ſaith Mr. *Norton* in p. 70.

Through anguiſh of his ſoul he had clods, rather than drops, of blood, ſtreaming down his bleſſed body, a thing which neither was ſeen nor heard, before or ſince, the true reaſon thereof (ſaith he) is, Chriſt died as a ſinner imputatively, prefſed under the ſenſe of the wrath of God.

If it be true that Chriſt ſweat clods of blood, then doubtleſs it was a miraculous ſweat, and then no natural reaſon can be given of the cauſe of it.

Reply 24. If it be true that Chriſt through the anguiſh of his ſoul had clods of blood ſtreaming down his bleſſed body, then doubtleſs it was a miraculous ſweat, and then no natural reaſon can be given as the cauſe of it; but I have all along affirmed that his Agony was from natural cauſes, and that his ſweat was increaſed by his ſtrong prayers and cryes, and that his

his sweat was not from the miraculous cause.

But I perceive that Mr. *Norton* himself is put in a wavering mind (in p. 66.) whether the sweat of Christ in his Agony was from the natural or from the miraculous cause; for when he had expounded his Query, he concludes thus,

We leave it to them that have leasure and skill to enquire. And (saith he) *Though the Evangelist mentioneth it as an effect proceeding from a greater cause than the fear of a meer natural death, notwithstanding* (saith he) *our Doctrine is not built only or chiefly upon this Argument.* Hence,

1 Any indifferent Reader may easily perceive that Mr. *Nortons* answer to his own Query is but a very wavering and confused answer; and therefore his bold conclusion aforesaid is built but upon a sandy foundation, and therefore it is not sufficient to satisfie a doubting conscience.

2 This speech of his, *our Doctrine is not built only or chiefly upon this Argument*, is a plain acknowledgment that the Agony of Christ, and his sweat like blood, is no sound Argument to prove that Christ conflicted with eternal death, and yet in p. 70, 39 68, 89, &c. he laies great weight upon his Agony, as a true reason to prove that he died as a sinner imputatively, pressed under the sense of the wrath of God, and conflicting with eternal death.

3 Mr. *Norton* is wavering in this, that he dares not affirm that Christ suffered the Torments of Hell, but by Gods extraordinary dispensation, as I have noted it in Chap. 7. Sect. 1.

4 Hence Mr. *Norton* might as well question whether the first touch or real impression of Hell pains would not utterly have dissolved the link and bond of nature (namely, of the sensitive soul) that is between mans mortal body, and his immortal soul in a moment? Seeing he holds, that his death was caused by the wrath of God; For he saith, *That his blood was shed together with the wrath of God, because it was shed as the blood of a person accursed.* For this is a clear Truth, That the vital body of man cannot subsist under the Torments of Hell, untill it bee made immortal by the power of God at the Resurrection.

5 Hence it may be propounded as another question of moment,

moment, whether the Greek word for this bloody sweat be not stretched beyond the Context, as well as hee hath done the word *Amazed*, in *Mark.* 14. 33. as I have shewed before.

6 Hence it may be considered what a learned Divine saith, There are some (saith he) that take Christs bloody sweat in that grievous agony to be a symptom of infernal pains. But (saith he) from what grounds, either in Philosophy or Divinity, I know not. If the pains of Hell, or hellish pains (so some distinguish) be procured by the fire of Hell, (be that material or immaterial) bloody sweat (saith he) can be no probable effect, of the one or of the other fire; nor is such sweat any *resultive*, or demonstrative sign of pains more grievous than may be inflicted or suffered by patience meerly natural.

For (saith he) however in cold Countries bloody sweats be as rare in mens bodies as showres of blood in the Air. Yet as a good Physiosopher hath long ago observed, To sweat blood is not usuall to *Italians*, yet usual onely, (as I take it) to men of that Climat in some particular diseases. CRUEL.

The most remarkable instance which I have read of bloody sweat in a man, not oppressed with any disease, is a Captain, an *Italian* (if I mistake not) who being surprised by the subtlety of his Enemy, whom he had trusted too far upon a Triftee of Parly; and thereby inforced either to yeeld up the Fort, which he had stoutly maintained, or otherwise, to be presently hanged.

The consideration of this perplexity, wherewith (through his own folly) he had intangled himself, did make such a deep impression into his generous spirits, that it squeezed blood out of his veins.

(And as this sudden fear squeezed blood out of the veins of this Captain, so in Reply 20. I have cited the speech of a Physician that saith thus, It sometimes happeneth that fervent spirits do so dilate the pores of the body, that blood passeth by them, and so the sweat may be bloody.)

And saith the former Author, our Savior (no doubt) as man had a more deep touch of all the malicious disgraces, and cruel

indignities which his enemies could put upon him, than this Captain had.

The measure of his bodily sufferings, and personal wrongs were in number far more, and for quality more grievous than ever were intended to this Captain, or any other mortal man by their enemies; And though the death of the cross was in it self an ignominious and cruel death, yet in our Saviors particular that was most true, * *Mortis modus morte pejor*; The manner of his Apprehension, of his double Arraign ment, and Conviction, of his usage before he was brought to the place of Execution, and all the time whiles the malice of the Jew and Gentile was wrecked upon him, was more grievous than the death of the Cross it self, without these grievous concomitants, could have been.

* Of the ignominious manner of his death, and what I have said on 1 Sam. 31.4. There *Saul* did so loathe to be put to a disgraceful death by the mockings of the Philistims, that he prayed his Armor-bearer, rather to kill him, as I have noted it in Gal 3.13. at Reply 6. And *Samson*, rather than to live to be an ignominious mocking-stock to the Philistims, desired to die, Judg. 16.25,26.

7 I find that many Divines, though they hold that Christ suffered in soul from the immediate wrath of God upon the cross; yet they do not hold that his Agony in the Garden was from the sense of the immediate wrath of God upon his soul.

But his sorrow and dread there, they make to be in relation of what he was afterwards to suffer upon the cross; and the fear of that (say they) was the cause of his bloody sweat.

Dr. *Williams* in his seven golden Candlesticks, p. 143, 144.

First, Dr. *Williams* saith, That the clear sight and consideration of that cup which he was to drink, was the cause of his Agony.

Bradshaw on justific. p. 75.

Secondly, Saith Mr. *Bradshaw*, Whiles he hung upon the accursed tree, he had such a deep sense of the incomparable wrath of God; that the very apprehension thereof (before it seized upon him) made him sweat drops of blood.

In his Coven. of Grace, p. 68.

Thirdly, Saith *George Downham*, The fear of Gods wrath when he was in his Agony, caused him to sweat great drops of blood, *Luk.* 22.44.

And (saith he) the sense thereof on the cross made him cry, My

My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?

Fourthly, Saith Mr. *Wall*, In his Agony in the Garden, he sweat drops not of water but of blood, &c. and all this in expectation of what he should suffer, when no hand touched him, but his own thoughts of what he was to suffer. *Wall* in his none but Christs p. 17.

I could cite divers others that speak to this purpose, But these are sufficient to evidence thus much, that many of the learned do hold, that though Christ suffered the wrath of God upon the cross, yet they deny he suffered the wrath of God in his Agony in the Garden, and therefore his bloody sweat is no certain reason to prove that he was prest under the sense of the wrath of God in the Garden, as Mr. *Norton* holds, though after he hath affirmed it, he doth again leave it doubtful, which doth not well agree to the property of a Judicious Confuter.

Fifthly, Seeing such eminent Divines as I have above cited, do hold that Christ suffered the wrath of God (not in the Garden, but) on the cross onely, once for all; It shews that Mr. *Norton* hath not so many Divines on his side as he intimates ever and anon, by us, and our, and we say, as in p. 44, &c.

8 It is also very considerable that there are sundry learned Divines that deny that our Savior sweat blood, and therefore they do much more deny that he sweat clods of blood (as Mr. *Norton* affirms he did) for the original word, they say, *his sweat was as it were great drops of blood.* And first, So speaks the *Greek* Text plainly. And secondly, So do our Translators interpret it; And thirdly, Saith Dr. *Hammon* in his paraphrase on *Luk.* 22. 44. He sweat (as men in agonies are wont) great glutenous drops, like those of blood when it drops on the ground; and saith hee in his Annotation, That Christ sweat drops of blood is not affirmed in this place, but only that he sweat drops of sweat of a strange thickness or viscousness, and consequently as big as when blood is wont to fall upon the ground; So saith *Justin Martyr*, *Theophylact*, and *Eutymius*.

(And truly I may well adde this, That seeing his sweat was in the open air, and in a cold night, it might well thicken as it ran down his body, and bee glutenous before it fell to the ground.)

And saith hee, ὡσεὶ, as, or as it were, doth note some re-

semblance, as (saith he) the Spirit descended as it were a Dove, *Matth.* 3. 16. somewhat resembling a Dove; So the Manna was like Coriander-seed in shape and quantity, but not in colour.

9 *Christopher Carlile* in his Descent, page 46. saith, Was not Christ extreamly afflicted, when he for fear of death, sweat drops, in quantity, as thick as drops of blood.

See his Ans. to Sir. *Tho. Moor*, p. 34. as it is printed with *Tindal's* works.

10 So *John Frith* the Martyr saith thus to Sir *Thomas Moure*, Christ did not only weep, but feared so sore, that he sweat like drops of blood running down upon the earth, which was more than to weep. Now (saith he) If I should ask you, why Christ feared and sweat so sore? what would you answer me? That it was for the fear of the pains of Purgatory; Forsooth he that should so answer, would bee laughed to scorn of all the world, as hee were well worthy: Wherefore was it then? *Verily even for the fear of death*, as it plainly appeareth after; for he prayed unto his Father saying, *My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me*, Mat. 26. 38, 39. So fearful a thing is death even to the purest flesh. And (saith he) the same cause will I assign in *Hezekiah*, that hee wept for fear of Death, and not of Purgatory.

In these words you see that *Frith's* judgement was, That Christs Agony was for fear, not of a spiritual, but of a corporal death.

11 *Tindal* translates *Luke* 22. 44. thus, His sweat was like drops of blood trickling down to the ground, and speaking of Christs last Supper, hee saith thus, The fear of death was the same hour upon him, neither slept hee any more after, but went immediately after he had comforted his Disciples, into the place, where he was taken, to abide his Persecutors, where also he sweat water and blood of very agony, conceived of his Passion so nigh at hand.

12 In Reply 18. I have cited Dr. *Lightfoot* saying, In his Agony he sweat drops like blood.

These five last Authors you see are not for sweating of perfect blood, though *Tindal* say, hee sweat water and blood; yet that is far from pure blood, and farther from clods of blood.

2 This

2 This is farther remarkable, that *Tindal* and *Frith*, do make the fear of his bodily death, in the words cited, to bee the cause of his Agony.

3 This is still farther remarkable, that neither of these two have a word in all their writings, that hee suffered any other death, but a bodily death; though Mr. *Norton* is so bold as to condemn their judgement therein to be heresie.

4 Saith Mr. *Norton* in page 67. *These Authors I not having by mee, cannot examine the Quotations, their words therefore rather better bearing the sense of the Orthodox, than the sense of the Dialogue.*

Reply 25. The Reader may please to take notice of Mr. *Nortons* unjust prejudice of the Dialogue, for the Author of the Dialogue cites their sense to his sense, which is so clear and manifest, that it stares him in the face; and yet their words (cited in the sense of the Dialogue) he saith is orthodox, and that the sense of the Dialogue is heresie; Is not this plain partiality, to favour the same doctrine in one as orthodox, and to condemn it in another for heresie.

And saith hee, *Friths other writings call to have it so*; namely, to mean it according to Mr. *Norton*.

Reply 26. It is an open wrong to Mr. *Frith*, and to the Reader, to make *Frith* of his judgement; the words of *Frith*, which I have truly cited him, do cry shame upon him for saying so; and in all his writings, hee makes the death of Christ to bee no other but a true bodily death.

12 I have cited *Cyprian* in *Reply* 8. to the sense of *Frith*, namely, to bee sorrowful unto death, and for the exceeding grief thereof to powre forth a bloody sweat.

13 *Damascen* saith thus, Christ took unto him all blamelesse and natural passions, for he assumed the whole man, and all that pertained to man, except sin; Natural and blamelesse passions are those, which are not in our power; and whatsoever entred into mans life through the condemnation of sin

sin (namely of *Adams* sin) as hunger, thirst, weakness, labour, weeping, corruption, shunning of death, fear, agony; whence sweat and drops of blood: These things (saith he) are in all men by nature, Christ therefore took all these unto him, that he might sanctifie them all. Howbeit our natural passions were in Christ according to nature, and above nature: According to nature they were stirred up in Christ when hee permitted his flesh to indure that which was proper to it: Above nature, because nature in him did never go before his will; for there was nothing forced in him, but all things voluntary; when hee would hee hungred, when he would hee thirsted, when hee would hee feared, and when hee would hee dyed.

From this speech of *Damasen* touching Christs Passion and Agony in the Garden, we see he held,

1 That shunning of Death, Fear, Agony, whence sweat and drops of blood, which are in all men by nature; and therefore, saith he, Christ took all these unto him, that hee might sanctifie them all.

2 That these were in Christ, not only according to nature, but above nature, because nature in him did never go before his will.

3 That nothing in him was forced, therefore hee was far from holding as Mr. *Norton* doth in page 70. that he was pressed under the sense of the wrath of God.

Conclusion.

When the fulness of time was come, that the seed of the woman, Christ Jesus, was to be bruised and peirced in the foot-soals, with an ignominious torturing death by Satan, and his instruments, according to Gods declared permission in *Gen.* 3.15.

The divine nature might not protect the humane, but must leave the humane nature to its self, to manage this conflict; in which conflict, he was to manifest his true humane infirmities; and therefore when the Devil and his Arch-instruments were to seise upon him; he began to be sore amazed, and to be very heavy, and then he said unto *Peter, James, and John, My soul is exceeding*

ceeding (sorrowful unto the death, or it is surrounded with sorrow, that is to say, Every part of my body, wherein I have my vital soul, is in a quaking fear of such an ignominious death by such a malignant enemy, as is armed with power and authority from God to execute it on me; and I do here manifest my true humane nature, and the infirmities of it, that you may record it to all posterity, that I have took part with them, that for fear of death, are all their life time subject to bondage, that they may be assured I am a merciful High-priest, and that I am truly touched with the feeling of their infirmities not in a small degree, for then it might be doubted, whether I am so sensible of their condition as I am, but in the highest degree, according to the most excellent temper, and tender constitution of my nature above the nature of other men.

But yet it is of necessity, that I must overcome this natural fear, because I have covenanted to lay down my life by my own will, desire, and power, *Joh.*10.17,18. and therefore my rational soul must betake it self to prayer, therefore tarry yee here and watch, and pray, that yee be not overcome by the many temptations that now are at hand to try you; and then he went a little from them, and fell on the ground and prayed, *That if it were possible, that hour might pass from him*, namely, that the dread of his ignominious usage might pass from him; for so much the hour imports in *Mark.*14.35,41. And his Agony was so great, that it caused him to sweat, as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground. And when he had three times offered up prayers and supplications to him that was able to save him from the natural dread of his ignominious torturing death, he was heard and delivered from the natural fear of his vital soul, because of his godly fear in his rational soul, and then he was confirmed against his natural fear; and so he never feared more after this, and then as soon as he had fulfilled all his sufferings, he did in perfection of patience and obedience, make his vital soul a sacrifice of Reconciliation for mans Redemption.

This Relation of Christs Combate, and of his Agony in his Combate is every way agreeable to the scope of the blessed Scriptures; and therefore Mr. *Nortons* Tenent must needs bee dangerous, because he makes this Combate to be between

Christs humane nature, and his divine, being pressed under the sense of Gods wrath, and conflicting with eternal death, and so forcing out clods of blood, as wine is forced from the grapes, by Gods pressing wrath; such expressions of pressing do utterly destroy the voluntariness of Christs obedience in his suffering, and do make him to be no lesse than an inherent sinner in his Death and Sacrifice.

CHAP. XVII.

SECT. I.

The Examination of Psal.22.1. *with* Matth.27.46.

THe Dialogue cites Mr. *Broughton*, saying, *My God, my God*, sheweth, That Christ was not forsaken of God, but that God was still his hope.

2 Saith he, The word *Forsaken*, is not in the Text; But why dost thou leave me to the griefs following (from the malice of the Jews) as they are expressed in the body of the Psalms.

3 Saith he, None ever propounded one matter, and made his amplification of another: But *Psal.*22. hath amplification of griefs caused by men, and not from Gods anger; And therefore the Proposition in the first verse, is not a complaint to God, that hee had forsaken his soul in anger for our sins, &c.

Mr. *Norton* Answers thus in page 78.

The Hebrew (as also the Syriack used by our Saviour in Mat.27.46.) and the Greek word used here by the Septuagint, signifie to leave another helpless in their necessity and extremity, which appeareth not only in its frequent use in the Scripture, but also in that this very word

word, per Antiphrasin (it being one of those Hebrew words that have two contrary significations) signifies to help up that which is down, and to for sake, Neh. 3. 8. & 4. 2. And such leaving we usually express by forsaking, and accordingly it is read by Latine Expositors, promiscuously, who do in effect say with Mr. Ainsworth, there is no material difference between leaving and forsaking, so as the meaning be kept sound.

Reply 1. He saith that this Hebrew word *Azab* to leave, is one of those Hebrew words that have two contrary significations; I wish he do not cast a mist in this speech as well before his own eyes as before his Readers. Though I am no Linguist, yet I love and approve such, as do labor to use the Originals to the advantage of the truth, and to the profit of the Reader.

The Hebrew word *Azab* hath two contrary significations as Mr. *Norton* affirmeth to amuse his Reader, about Gods forsaking Christ

But as far as I can learn, this Hebrew word *Azab* is none of those that have two contrary significations (if there be any such, when things are searched to the bottom) but yet I freely grant that this word, as well as many others, have several differing significations (but not contrary) namely, a proper signification and a metaphorical.

But saith Mr. *Norton*, *It hath two contrary significations. First, Because it signifies to help up that which is down, as well as to leave or forsake.*

Reply 2. I grant that *Azab* by a necessary consequence from the context doth signifie helping up that which is down, and in this he alludes to *Exod.* 23. 5. and there the words run thus, *If thou see the Ass of him that hateth thee lying under his burden, and wouldest forbear to help him, thou shalt surely help with him.* I grant that our Translation doth twice in this Text render *Azab*, *to help*, but yet in the Margin they translate it to *leave*, in both places, according to the propriety of the Hebrew, thus, & wouldest cease to leave thy business for him, thou shalt surely leave it to joyn with him; & hence it follows by a necessary consequence, that if he must leave his business to joyn with his hater, whose Ass lies under his burden, it must be to help him; and in this respect the Translators may well render *Azab* to *help*; And to the like sense Exod. 23. 5.

doth *Ainſworth* tranſlate it in his Annotations, When thou ſhalt ſee thy haters Aſs lying under his burden, then thou ſhalt ceaſe from forſaking him; and hence it follows, that he that ceaſeth from forſaking his hater when his Aſs lies under his burden, muſt needs help him: And therefore in the next clauſe Mr. *Ainſworth* reads it thus, Thou ſhalt leaving leave (thine own buſineſs to be) with him; thou ſhalt not leave him, by paſſing away on the other ſide of the way, as the Prieſt and the Levite did from the wounded man, but thou ſhalt leave thy hatred to help him, as the *Samaritan* did, *Luk.*10.33,34. And according to this ſenſe the Seventy render it thus, Thou ſhalt not paſs by the ſame (that is, thou ſhalt not leave his Aſs under his burden) but ſhalt raiſe up the ſame, together with him. And the Chalde ſpeaks thus, Thou ſhalt leave what is in thine heart againſt him; and hence it follows, That he that leaves what is in his heart againſt his hater, when his Aſs lies under his burden, muſt needs help him.

Therefore from hence I conclude, that the Tranſlating of *Azab* to help, is more from the ſenſe of the Context, than from the proper ſenſe of the word, and therefore though it be tranſlated to *help up*, yet that doth not prove it to have a contrary ſenſe to *leave*, it onely proves that *Azab* may be taken in a various ſenſe according to the circumſtances of the Context, where it is uſed.

The like he affirms of a contrary ſenſe in other words, p.48. and he gives three inſtances, To which I anſwer, that they are not contrary, though different in reſpect of the metaphorical ſenſe, and ſo the word *Tzedec Righteouſneſs*, is often put for a counterfeit righteouſneſs, which in proper ſpeaking is unrighteouſneſs in Gods ſight. And therefore the Seventy tranſlate it unrighteouſneſs, in *Ezek.*21.3. *Iſa.*49.24. But it is ironically called righteouſneſs.

Secondly, Saith Mr. *Norton*, *Azab*, *ſignifies to Fortifie*, *Neh.* 3.8. & 4.2.

Reply 3. I grant that to *fortifie* is contrary to *leaving* and *forſaking*, in caſe it can have no other ſenſe in the place cited; But our larger Annotations on *Nehem.*3.8. do rightly expound our Margin

Margin Translation (which is according to the propriety of the Hebrew word *Azab*) of leaving off to fortifie when they came to the broad wall, because that was done in former times, and was still standing undemolished as the rest was, and the like sense they give of *Neh.*4.2. and the like sense must be given of *Azab*, in *Isa.*49.25. and therefore as yet there is no contrary signification of the word *Azab*, as Mr. *Norton* doth make his Reader beleeve, to bewilder his understanding, in the manner of Gods leaving or forsaking Christ on the Cross.

But for the better finding out the truth, I will first give some instances of the various sense of *Azab*, and then I will examine what sense it hath in *Psa.*22.1.

1 It is used in a metaphorical sense for a Mart or Fair, *Ezek.* 27.12,14,16,19,22. And it is also used for Wares of Merchandize, in *Ez.*27.27,33. And the reason is plain, because in Fairs and Markets there is an usual and continual leaving of one thing for another by way of contract, as of mony for Wares, and of Wares for mony, & of one sort of Ware for another. So in like sort the Hebrew word *Gnereb* (which in propriety doth signifie the connexion or con-joyning of two or more things together) is used by *Ezekiel* by a Metonymia for Fairs or Markets, and for Wares of Merchandize, *Ezek.*27.13,17, &c. Because of the connexion and conjoyning of sundry sorts of Wares to sell, and because of the sundry conjunctions between men, by contracts about Wares, as I have shewed at large in my Treatise of *Holy Time.*

2 As *Azab* is put for leaving one thing for another in Markets, so it is put for any other kind of leaving, either by way of agreement or disagreement; As for example, when it is agreed that two shall strive for the mastery, there all friends must stand aside, and leave their friend alone to try the mastery, as *David* was left of his friends, when he alone undertook to try masteries with *Goliah.*

3 Leaving is put for leaving of a mans own business, to help another in his necessity, as in *Ezek.* 23.5. afore expounded.

4 Leaving is put for forsaking, or leaving another that is helpless in their necessity. Sometimes it is to leave in anger, as 2 *Chron.*24.25. And sometimes not in anger but by necessity,

1 *Sam.* 30. 13. And ſometimes willingly, and ſo *Mary* left *Martha* to ſerve, whiles ſhe attended to Chriſts Doctrine, and in that reſpect *Martha* complained to Chriſt, ſaying, *Doſt thou not care that my Sister hath left me alone to ſerve*, *Luk.* 10.40. There *Sabactani* is in the *Syriack* juſt as it is in *Pſa.* 22. 1. and in *Mat.* 27.46.

5 Leaving in Hebrew, is often uſed in mercy, favor and kindneſs, as in *Ruth* 2.16. *Jer.* 49.11. and ſo it is uſed in the *Chalde*, in *Dan.* 4.15,26. the word Leave there is in favor, as ver.26, ſheweth.

6 *Azab* is applied to Gods leaving or forſaking of notorious ſinners in anger, 2 *Chron.* 24.18,20,24. *Deut.* 31.17. & 32.36. 1 *King.* 14.10 & 21.21. 2 *King.* 14.26. Yea, ſometimes Gods hatred is joyned to his leaving or forſaking, as in *Iſa.* 60.15. But remember this, that God never forſakes any in wrath, but ſuch as do firſt forſake him by provoking ſins.

7 *Azab* is uſed for leaving of a mans firſt love to the Truth, in *Prov.* 3.3. *Let not Mercy and Truth leave thee*, or forſake thee.

8 God left *Hezekiah* onely to try his heart, 2 *Chron.* 32.31.

9 *Azab* is put for a leaving of thoſe that a man loves well, to cleave to that which a man loves better, as to leave a Father for a Wife, *Gen.* 2.24. *Ruth.* 1.16.

10 A man leaves a thing becauſe he is forced, *Gen.* 39.12,13, 15, 18.

11 A man often leaves that he loves through haſte, *Joſh.* 8.17. 1 *Sam.* 30.13.

12 Hee leaves a thing through fear, 1 *King.* 31.7. 1 *Chron.* 10.7.

13 *Azab* is to leave, or ceaſe, or reſt from complaining, and ſo the Divine nature did often reſt, or ceaſe, or leave the Humane nature to his own natural principles in his ſufferings and combatings with Satan and his Inſtruments.

Theſe ſeveral ſenſes of *Azab*, and many ſuch like, do ſhew the various ſenſe of the word *leaving*.

14 And this is worth the noting, That though *Azab* doth often ſignifie ſuch a leaving as is a forſaking, yet it doth not alwaies ſignifie forſaking as it doth leaving. For *Azab* is applied to ſundry kinds of leaving, which cannot with any fit-

neſs

nese he called a forsaking, as in *Gen.* 39. 6. *Potiphar* left all he had in trust in *Joseph's* hand. So in *Gen.* 50. 8. *Their little ones, and their flocks and their herds they left in the land of* Goshen. And so in *Exod.* 9. 21. 2 *Sam.* 15. 16. and so in *Ruth.* 2. 16, *Boaz* commanded his Reapers to let fall some of their handfuls, and leave them in kindness, on purpose for *Ruth* to glean them. So *Job* 39. 14. The Ostrich leaveth her eggs in the warm dust to hatch her young ones. So in *Jer.* 49. 11. *Mic.* 4. 1. 2 *Chron.* 28. 14. *Ezra* 6. 7. And in many other places might be cited to prove that *Azab* cannot so fitly be translated to forsake, as to leave. I grant notwithstanding, that the word *leave* is so large, that many times it doth most fitly agree to the word *forsake* in the largest use of it. But ere long I shall shew the particular sense of the word *left* or *forsaken*, *Psa.* 22. 1.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in the page aforesaid.

The meaning of the word leave or forsake, was kept sound with Mr. Ainsworth, but with you it is not.

Reply 4. I grant that Mr. *Ainsworth* did hold, that God forsook or left Christs soul in wrath, but yet for all that, he was far from holding as Mr. *Norton* doth; namely, that Christ suffered the Essential torments of Hell. I received some Letters from him not many years before his death, about the point of Christs sufferings; And his Letters tell me that he held this as a principle, that Christ suffered no other afflictions for kind, but what the Elect do suffer in this life, though in a far greater measure (now seeing he held this as a Principle, he could not hold that Christ suffered Gods penal and vindicative wrath, except he had also held that the Elect do suffer Gods penal and vindicative wrath in this life; But seeing all the punishments of the godly are called but chastisements, even so the greatest of Christs sufferings on the cross, are also comprised under the word chastisement, *Isa.* 53. 5.) But yet I grant also that Mr. *Ainsworth* held, that as the Elect do often suffer Gods wrath, so did Christ; and in this last point I differed from him, for though I hold that Gods chastisements on his own people are from his fatherly wrath, yet I also believe that Christs chastisements

Isa. 53. 5. All Christs greatest sufferings are comprised under the word chastisement, *Isa.* 53. 5.

Burgus saith well that Jobs afflictions were to him as a storm or tempest is to a skilful Pilot; or what a valiant Adversary is to a stout Champion, on *justif.* p. 28. and such was the nature of all Christs chastisements.

stisements were not from Gods wrath for correction to amendment as ours are. But from the conditions of the voluntary Covenant, Christ was to suffer chastisements from the rage of Satan, for the tryal of the perfection of his patience and obedience; and because he continued constant in his obedience through all his sufferings from Satans rage, therefore his sufferings have the condition of merit.

Besides this, in all Mr. *Ainsworths* five Books on *Moses*, and the *Psalms*, which were published before this intercourse of Letters, I find nothing in any of them that Christ suffered the Essential torments of Hell. And therefore Mr. *Ainsworth* was not found in the sense of these words, *Why hast thou forsaken me*, according to Mr. *Nortons* Tenent, though he was far more sound than Mr. *Norton* is.

2 I can instance the like in several other eminent Divines that held satisfaction by suffering Gods wrath in some degree, and yet were far from holding as Mr. *Norton* doth, that Christ suffered the *very* essential Torments of Hell both of loss and sense, as Mr. *Weems* in his portracture p. 208. saith thus, Because some things were unbeseeming to the person of Christ, as the Torments of Hell, the compensation of it was supplied by the worthiness of the person, and to this purpose I could cite *Ball* on the Covenant, p. 200. and others also.

3 Our larger Annotations on *Psa.* 22. 1. speak thus, Christ, as man did suffer partly in his body, and partly in his soul (but more in his soul than in his body) more than can either be expressed by man, or be imagined. I do not see how any reasonable man can question that reads the story of his passion, from his bloody sweat unto the end, and considers Christs own expressions recorded to us, that we might know how much he hath suffered for us.

(But saith the Annotation) I will not say that there was a necessity that he should suffer so much, just so much, both in Body and Soul to make his sufferings available to our Redemption, both of our bodies and of our souls. This I dare not say, because I have no warrant for it in the Scriptures, and bare humane Ratiocination in these things is meer folly and madness.

This wary and judicious Annotation is quite opposite to Mr.

Mr. Nortons Tenent, for Mr. *Norton* holds no ſufferings to be available to our Redemption but a juſt ſatisfaction to the Law, namely, Chriſts ſuffering of the Eſſential puniſhment of Hel tormente both of loſs and ſenſe, both in body and ſoul. But ſaith this Annotation, I will not ſay there was a neceſſity that he ſhould ſuffer ſo much, juſt ſo much, both in body and ſoul, to make his ſufferings available to our Redemption, both of our bodies and ſoul; This (ſaith the Annotation) I dare not ſay, becauſe I have no warrant for it in the Scripture.

But Mr. *Norton* heaps up abundance of Scripures to prove that Chriſt ſuffered the very eſſential torments of Hell, both in body and ſoul, and therefore according to this Annotation they muſt needs be wreſted from their right ſenſe; for this Annotation accounts all that can be ſaid for it, to be but bare humane ratiocination, and calls it meer folly and madneſs. But Mr. *Norton* on the contrary doth boldly damn this denial in this Annotation to be Hereſie, ſuch an antypathy there is between his Tenent and this Annotation. But the Lord hath his time when truth ſhall prevail againſt Mr. *Nortons* moſt dangerous Scripture-leſs Tenent.

Our larger Annotation on Pſ. 22. 1. doth account Mr. *Nortons* way of ſatisfaction to be but bare humane ratiocination, which is but meer folly and madneſs

But ſaith Mr. *Norton* in p. 78.

Pſal. 22. hath amplification of griefs cauſed by man inſtrumentally, and by Gods anger as the efficient cauſe.

Reply 5. Mr. *Norton* affirms that Gods anger was the efficient cauſe of all the griefs that Chriſt ſuffered from his Cradle to his Croſs. But the Dialogue goes in another ſtrain, the Dialogue makes all Chriſts ſufferings to be founded efficiently in the eternal Council, and in the voluntary Covenant that was made between the Trinity for mans Redemption, and therefore he was to perform all as a voluntary Covenanter (and was not to be over-ruled by Gods judiciall imputation of our ſins to him, and by his ſupreme compulſory power in preſſing him under the ſence of his immediate wrath;) namely, that Chriſt ſhould take on him the ſeed of the deceived woman, and in that nature ſhould enter the Liſts and Combate with Satan, as I have

often expounded Gods declared will, in Gen. 3. 15. for it pleased God to put an utter enmity between the Devil and the seed of the woman, even from the foundation of the world, Gen. 3. 15. to try masteries, and *Isay* fore-told that Christ should by his obedience to the death, get the victory, and divide the spoil, *Isa.* 53. 12.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in p. 78.

Anger, in Scripture, is sometimes taken for the hatred of God unto a person; sometimes, for the execution of vindicative Justice; in this latter sense God was angry with Christ, not in the former.

Reply 6. In Chapter 5. I have shewed from Dr. *Ames*, that the essential torments of Hell are inflicted from Gods hatred; And thence it follows, That if Christ did suffer the essential torments of Hell, then he suffered them from Gods hatred.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in p. 79.

Christ doth complain in Psal. 22. *that God had forsaken him in anger for our sin.*

Reply 7. I shall not need to make any other Reply to this than his own words, in p. 42. *To complain against God*, saith he, *is a sin and sheweth grudging.*

But saith Mr. *Norton* in p. 79.

Gods forsaking is either total and final, so God forsakes the Reprobate; or partial and temporal, as concerning the fruition and sense of the good of the Promise; so God forsook Christ, and of this forsaking Christ, complaineth in this place.

Reply 8. The punishment of loss is variously and contrariously delivered by Mr. *Norton*, as I have shewed at large in Chap.

But I come now to open the word *Forsaken*, in *Psal.* 22. 1. And I will open the sense by answering these three Questions.

I. *How did God forsake Christ on the Cross?*

II. *Why did God forsake Christ on the Cross?*

III. *How did God not forsake Christ on the Cross?*

Question I.

How did God forsake Christ on the Cross?

Reply. I Have in part shewed how in the Dialogue, but I will add somewhat to confirm it.

1. Therefore I say, that God forsook Christ on the Cross, by not protecting him from the hands of Satan and his Instruments. God forsook Christ on the cross by not protecting him against his crucifiers.

On this, God put enmity between the Devil and the seed of the woman; and it was agreed between the Trinity from eternity, that Christ in his humane nature should try masteries with the power & policy of Satan and his Instruments, & therefore it was agreed also, that God should leave the humane nature of Christ alone to manage this Combate; and it was agreed also to permit the Devill to use all his power and policy, to do his worst to disturb the patience of the humane nature, and so to pervert him in his obedience, that so his first Head-plot might not be broken. I say in this Combate the Godhead was to leave the Humane nature to its own principles, and to permit the Devil to use his utmost power and policy to encounter with his Humane nature, and therefore he brought into the Garden a Band of Souldiers, armed with Swords and Staves, to apprehend him, and to bind him like a Felon, and to carry him as a prisoner, first before the Priest, and then before *Pilat*, and there to lay many criminal accusations against him, and at last to crucifie him for a notorious malefactor with all manner of ignominy, and torturing pains; and in all these injurious abuses God did not protect him, nor put out any power,

to deliver him; And thus God forsook Christ on the Cross, and left him helpless, as a Combater ought to, be in the trial of Masteries.

2 This expositon of the word *Forsaken*, must needs be the right interpretation, because it agrees to the Context in *Psal.* 22. whence it is taken, and therefore I will make it appear by comparing it with the Context.

1 The next adjoyning sentence to the word *Forsaken*, is this, *Why art thou so far from helping me?* namely, against my envious Adversaries; his condition was such that it needed some help from God to suppress them; but it had not been so fit to call upon God to help him, to suppress his own vindicative wrath (if any such thing had been) as Mr. *Norton* affirms.

2 The next sentence doth also explain the former; *Why art thou so far from the words of my roaring?* for though God had heard his earnest prayers in the Garden, and had fully delivered his humane nature from the dread of the Cup, yet not from the Cup it self of his sufferings; and it is also cleer by verse 19. that God heard him in regard of inward support (though not in regard of outward deliverance). *Be not far from me, because trouble is neer, and there is none to help me*; that is, be not far from supporting my inward man, for there is none to help me in regard of my outward man: I know by thy revealed Decree in *Gen.* 3. 15. that thou hast given Satan power over my outward man, to put mee to death as a Malefactor on the Cross.

3 He prayes again in verse 19. *Be not far from me, O Lord, my strength, hasten to help me, deliver my soul from the sword, my desolate soul from the power of the Dog.* In these words Christ doth acknowledge God to be his strength, even now in this time of his greatest passions: And hence it follows, that when he cryed, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me*, that he felt God to bee his strength in the inward man (at least) though at the same time God did forsake him by leaving his outward man into the hands of Satan and his instruments, or else his mouth, and his heart did not go together, when he did acknowledge God to be his strength, and when he cryed out, *My God, my God*: This appellation shews that God was his strength in the inward

ward man, through God left his outward man to the power of Satan, and his Instruments, to crucifie him as a Malefactor; and therefore his next Petition is, *Hasten to help me*, that so my body may also be delivered from the power of these Dogs, by my Resurrection on the third day, according to his faith, in *Psal.* 16. 10.

4. And lastly, This is remarkable, that Christ did not utter these words, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me*, until hee had fulfilled all his appointed sufferings from the Devils instruments, as it was declared in *Gen.* 3. 15. and as they are largely expressed in this Psalm; and therefore the word *Forsaken*, doth relate to Gods outward leaving him in the whole course of his sufferings, from his apprehension to his death.

2 *This interpretation of the manner how God did forsake Christ is strengthned by the concurrence of sundry eminent orthodox Divines.*

1 *P. Martyr* on *Phil.* 2. enumerating the calamities that Christ suffered, begins thus; The first calamity (saith hee) is to lose estimation, the Theef was preferred above Christ, *Barabas* was discussed, and Christ was counted among the wicked.

2 Saith hee, Another calamity was touching bodily deliverance, he was destitute of Gods help, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me*: And he cites *Austin* to his sense; But I pray take notice, that hee applies this speech, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me*, to his bodily deliverance: How far wide is he from Mr. *Norton* effectual torments on Christs soul; but for want of due observation, Mr. *Norton* thinks, that all the Orthodox run on his side, but upon better search, hee may see the contrary.

2 *Bucer* in *Mat.* 27. 46. saith, Christ here complained that he was forsaken (or left) of his Father into the hands of the wicked, to indure all their rage.

3 *Bullinger* in *Mat.* 27. saith, To forsake, in Christ upon the Cross, is to permit; so that this was the meaning of Christ; *Why dost thou suffer me to be thus afflicted? why dost thou permit these things to mine enemies? When wilt thou deliver me?*

4 Dr. Lightfoot in his Harmony on the New Testament, page 72. saith thus, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me*, not forsaken him as to the feeling of any spiritual desertion; but why left to such hands, and to such cruel usage.

Ibidem; In his Commentary on *Act.* 2. 37. he saith, Why should not these words, *My God, my God*, be translated, *Why hast thou left me, and given me up to such hands, & ame, and torturs?* rather than to intricate the sense with a surmise of Christs spiritual desertion.

5 Mr. *Robert Wilmot* in his Manuscript on Christs Descent, on these words in *Act.* 2. 25. *He is at my right hand*, saith thus, God is at Christs right hand for support and comfort, as in this Text, and in *Psal.* 109. *ult.* This by the way, One would think (saith he) evinceth, That the complaint of our Lord in *Psal.* 22. 1. and in *Mat.* 27. 46. imports not any total dereliction, or desertion without all comfort, but a leaving of the holy One of God, *Mark.* 1. 14. to the extremities of wicked men, mentioned in that Psalm, and felt upon the Cross.

Ibidem, Upon the word *Always*, he saith thus, The ground of his gladness was *Always*; for as much as he saw God on his right hand *Always*, therefore his gladness thereon grounded, was *Always*: And hence it follows (saith he) that his gladness was never from him, no not when hee said, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me*, or rather left me, namely, to the torments after mentioned in the Psalm: And indeed (saith he) *My God, my God*, how could it hee spoken especially doubled, and that of him who felt what he spake, without the apprehension of that sound joy and gladness that is couched under, and grounded on those words? And yet (saith he) I go not about to lessen his pains, I tremble to do so, yea I tremble to think so; but as *Job* saith, Chap. 13. 7. 8. 9. *Wee must not speak untruly for God, nor talk otherwise than the thing is for him.*

6 Mr. *Robert Smith* (whom the Dialogue through mistake calls Mr. *Henry Smith*) a Reverend Divine, though silenced through the iniquity of the times, he drew up that Argument, that is prefixed to the Table of the Dialogue, against Gods forsaking of Christs soul in wrath.

7 Mr. *Wotton* hath expressed to my self his dislike of their ex-

exposition that holds that God forsook Christs soul in wrath, and Mr. *Sarah* abovesaid, concurred with his judgement.

8 *Jerom* in *Mar.* 27. saith, Marvel not at Christs complaint of being forsaken, when thou seest the scandal of his Cross.

9 *Bernard de verbis*, *Es. Ser.* 5. saith, This was the dereliction that Christ meant in his complaint, there was a kind of forsaking Christ (on the Cross) when there was, in so great necessity, no demonstrance of his power, no manifestation of his Majesty (or divine power.)

10 *Lyra* in *Matth.* 27. saith, Christ was forsaken of God his Father, because he was left in the hands of those that slew him.

11 I have cited *Christopher Carlile* to this sense, and others, in the Dialogue, page 60.

I could also cite more to this Exposition: But the judicious Reader will think it needless, and therefore I forbear.

SECT. II.

Question II.

Why did God forsake Christ on the Cross?

THis indeed is the most proper Question to be answered, because Christ propounded this Query with a loud voyce, in the audience of a multitude both of friends and enemies: As if Christ had said, I would have the cause why God hath left me into the hands of Satans instruments, to be sought out, and understood of all men.

God forsook Christ on the Cross, because his humane nature might be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, in all the afflictions that were written of him.

Reply 10. The cause in general was from the voluntary Contract and Covenant between the Trinity, that so the humane nature of Christ might fulfil Gods Decree; for if God had not forsaken Christ, or left him in the hands of the Devil and his instruments, how could *Herod*, and *Pontius Pilate*, with the Gentiles, and the people of *Israel*, have done whatsoever Gods hand and counsel had determined before to be done? *Act.* 4. 27, 28.

2 How could *Pilate* have had power given him from above to condemn him, if God had not forsaken him, & left him to his power? *Joh.*19.10,11. For who is he that saith, That any thing falleth out, which the Lord commandeth not? So *Bro.* reads *Lam.*3.37.

3 How else could the body of Christ have been passable, and subject to tortures, if the divine nature had not left the humane to its infirmities according to Covenant? for Christ was not subject by Nature, but by Covenant only to suffer afflictions; and therefore the divine nature did by Contract and Covenant, leave the humane, that it might bee passable, and that so his obedience to the Articles of the Covenant, might have the condition of meriting.

Austin saith in his 60. Tract on *John*, Christ was troubled, not through any weakness of mind, but of power; Christ admitted the affections of fear, &c. and the infirmities of mans nature, not for want of power to repress them, but by voluntary obedience and humility, that in him they might bee meritorious.

4 Christ told *Peter*, That he must not bee protected at this time against the Devil, and his Instruments; and therefore bee bid *Peter* to put up his sword, and not to use it for his protection, saying, *Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve Legions of Angels?* But (said he) *how then shall the Scriptures be fulfilled, that say, Thus it must be?* Mat.26.53.54. *I must fulfil all that is written of my sufferings, Act.*13.29. *Luke* 24.26,46. Therefore neither my Father nor I, must countenance the use of the sword for my protection; and therefore it is not my Fathers will to give, nor my will to pray for twelve legions of Angels to protect me from my sufferings, from Satan, and his instruments, for I have covenanted to be the seed of the woman, and in that nature to enter the Lists with Satan, and therefore there is a necessity for my divine nature to withdraw, that Satan may do the worst he can to conquer the patience and obedience of my humane nature, that so he may thereby pursue his Head-plot, if but can from being broken, namely, in case he can prevail to disturb my patience and obedience.

Mat.26.54.

5 With

3 With a loud voyce Christ propounds this Query, *why hast thou forsaken me?* seeing formerly till now thou hast ever protected me against the prevailing power of Satan and his Instruments,

1 From the womb, *Psa.22.9,10.*

2 From the cruelty of *Herod* when I hung at my Mothers brest, *Matth.2.13,14.*

3 From the manifold way-layings of the Jews to kill me, *Matth.26.55. Joh.8.59.& 10.39.*

The Answer is, That the Scriptures may be fulfilled, *Matth. 26.56.*that say thus it must be, *Matth.26.54.*

And therefore Christ told his Disciples saying, now the appointed hour and power of darkness is come upon me, *Luk.22. 53.* according to Gods declared decree, in *Gen.3.15.* and therefore take notice of the true reason why God hath forsaken me, For,

1 Else I could not be thus used by the powers of darkness.

2 Else I could not be touched so deeply with the sensible feeling of mans infirmities, as I ought to be.

3 Else it could not be known that I am so sensible of them as I am, unless I did expresse it by crying out as a man in misery, *why hast thou forsaken me?*

4 Else it might well be questioned whether ever I had a true humane nature or no, if I should not declare my sense of my present sufferings.

5 Else I cannot make it manifest that I am a *true* mercifull High Priest, except I make it manifest that I am eminently touched with a true sense and feeling of mans infirmities.

6 Neither can I be a compleate consecrated Priest except the perfection of my patience and obedience be true and manifested through sharp and harsh sufferings, *Heb.2. 10.17.*

7 Neither can I make my death to bee a propitiatory sacrifice, until I am compleatly consecrated by enduring afflictions.

Therefore that I may make it evident that my humane nature is thus qualified, I must cry out with a loud voyce at the

end of all my sufferings, Why God my God why hast thou forsaken me? or left me to the prevailing power of death? to endure such an ignominious and painful death?

8 It is most evident that the last extrinsecal part of Christs Priestly consecration was ordained to be finished by his sufferings, from the malice and enmity of his proclaimed enemy Satan, according to *Gen.* 3.15. compared with *Heb.* 2. 10,17. and *Heb.* 5.8,9. And this is yet the more to be marked, because God ordained that the consecration of *Aaron* and his Sons, should not be finished without some trial of his obedience under some kind of affliction, for God commanded them to keep a strict watch at the door of the Tabernacle for seven dayes, and seven nights together, in all which space they were separated from their Wives and Families, upon pain of Gods heavy displeasure by death; and until they had manifested the perfection of their obedience under this appointed measure of affliction, they might not offer any sacrifice for the procuring of Gods Atonement, *Levit.* 9.7. but so soon as they were thus consecrated, then the very next day they were commanded to draw near to God, and to offer sacrifices of Reconciliation. And to this purpose I have given another hint from the words of Mr. *Trap* in Reply 27.

Heb. 2.10.

Hence I reason thus, If the Divine nature had protected the Humane nature of Christ against the power of his proclaimed enemy, Satan, in this appointed hour, for the Prince of darkness to exercise his utmost power against, as he did in former times, from the prevailing power of *Herod*, in *Matth.* 2. and from the prevailing power of his Townsmen at the hill *Nazareth*, *Luk.* 4 29,30. and from his conspirators, in *Joh.* 8.59. then he could not have fulfilled Gods appointed and declared Decree in *Gen.* 3.15. & his own Covenant, which was, that he would enter the Lists in his Humane nature, from the seed of the woman, with his combater Satan, and give him so much liberty as to pierce him in the Foot-soals as a sinful malefactor, and yet that he would continue obedient through all his greatest temptations and tryals. And his Father covenanted that his temptations and trials from his Combater, Satan, should be for his ultimate extrinsecal consecration, and that then he should

make

make his soul a sacrifice of reconciliation for the breaking of the Devils Head-plot.

Therefore that he might manifest the perfection of his obedience through all his sharpest sufferings from his malignant Combater Satan, his Divine nature must forsake, or rest, or cease or leave his Humane nature, that so his humane nature alone might undergo the combats from the malice of his proclaimed enemy, and might manifest the truth of his humane nature, by evidencing that he was eminently touched with the quick sense and feeling of our infirmities, and by manifesting the perfection of his patience and obedience under all, before he could make his soul a propitiatory sacrifice.

And to this sense do the Orthodox speak.

Ireneus saith, That Christ was crucified and died, the word (namely, the Divine nature) *Resting*, that is, saith *Bastingus*, not using his power, not putting forth his strength, to the intent he might be crucified and die.

In his chap. of Christs sufferings.

And hence we may take notice that this phrase, *The Divine nature resting*, is the very same with Gods forsaking or leaving of the humane nature of Christ in his combate with Satan; as it is expounded by sundry Orthodox, which I will cite by and by.

Because the humane nature was no true part of the divine person, but an appendix only, therefore the divine nature could and did leave the humane nature alone to combate with Satan, that so it might be touched with a quick sense of all his ill usage, and might manifest the same by crying out, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?*

But saith Mr. *Norton* in p. 79.

If the pain of loss be not joyned with the pain of sense, there can be no sufficient cause given of so bitter and lamentable a cry from that person that was God and man.

Reply 11. Though that person was God and man, yet that hinders not but that his humane nature might make that bitter and lamentable cry from the sense of the Devils ill usage; his being God and Man in personal union, did indeed priviledge his humane nature from sinful perturbations in his passions, and so consequently from Gods coacted Justice, but it did not hinder him from his own voluntary passions, nor from his voluntary sufferings from his malicious enemy Satan, nor from manifesting his true sense and feeling of them, because his humane nature was no true part of the divine person, for then

it could not have been left of his divine nature to suffer any thing at all, except Mr. *Norton*, will say, That his divine nature was passible; But because it was no true part, but an Appendix only to his divine person (as *Zanchy* sheweth in his Appendix to his Confession of the Faith) therefore the divine nature might, and did rest, cease, leave, or forsake the humane nature to manage the combate alone with Satan, that so it might be sensible of his sufferings (from Satans power granted to him in *Gen.*3.15.) more than other men can be, because of the exact purity of his natural temper above all other men, and in these respects it came to pass that he did make that bitter and lamentable cry, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?*

I say, that the union of his humane nature to his divine person, was so ineffable, that the divine nature could, and did forsake, leave, cease, or rest from protecting or assisting his humane nature, that so it might undertake the combate alone with Satan, and that so it might be touched with the quick sense and feeling of our infirmites more than other men can be, and so it made him to cry out, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?*

Though the humane nature of Christ from its first union had its dependance & subsistance in his divine person, yet such is the singleness and unmixedness of the divine nature in this union, that it could, and did leave the humane nature to act of it self, according to its own natural principles.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 191.

As the humane nature of Christ did not subsist alone, so neither doth it perform any humane operations alone; dependance in respect of subsistence, inferreth a dependance in respect of operations, &c.

In these words, Mr. *Norton* doth argue more like to a natural Philosopher, than to a judicious Divine; for though the humane nature of Christ did ever subsist in his divine person from the time of the union, yet it did not subsist in his divine person according to the order of natural causes, but after the ineffable manner of the voluntary cause, of which the rule is not true, *posità causâ sequitur effectus*, for such voluntary causes do work according to the liberty of the voluntary agreement of the persons in Trinity.

2 I say also, that the form of this union cannot be exemplified from any natural or civil union, and therefore the operations that flow from this union, may well

differ from the operations that flow from all other unions.

I grant that *Athanasius* doth in some respects fairly exemplifie this union to the union of our soul and body, making one man, but yet in some respects it will not hold. See *Parens* Notes on *Athanasius* Creed Art. 4.

In two things, saith *Parens*, this similitude doth not agree.

1 Because in man, by reason of the union of the reasonable soul and body, some third thing specifically different is made up, to wit, man of matter and form, neither of which alone is man. It is not so (saith he) in Christ, because the word, Assuming the flesh was God, and the same person both before, and after the Incarnation, heretofore without flesh, and afterwards cloathed with it.

2 Saith he, The soul of man receives into it the passions of the body, with which is grieveth and rejoyceth, but God, the word, is void of all affection and passion.

Therefore seeing this union is so unexpressible, the operations of each nature may well differ from the operations of all other unions.

3 Seeing it was the will of the blessed Trinity, according to their agreement in the voluntary Covenant, that the two natures of the Mediator should keep each nature, and their properties distinct: Thence the Mediator might act either as man only, or as God only, or as God and man joyntly: And this observation is of necessary use for the right understanding of many Scriptures, as it is noted by the Dialogue from Mr. *Calvin* in p. 111. and to him I will adde Mr. *Thomas Wilson*, for in his Theological Rules for the right understanding of the Scriptures, hee saith thus; In his 111. Theological Rule, p. 164.

Some of the works of Christ were proper to his God-head, as his miracles.

Secondly, Some to his Man-hood, as his natural and moral works.

Thirdly, Some to his whole person, as his works of Mediation, in which each nature did that which was proper to it (but Mr. *Norton* makes no good use of this rule.)

And all these several operations do arise from the unexpressible nature of this union, which doth work according to the agreement of the persons in the voluntary Covenant: And

of this I have also given a touch before in page 174.

2 I have made it evident in the former Chapter, That the most excellent temper, and tender constitution of Christs humane nature, did make all his sufferings to be abundantly more sharp and keen to his senses, than the like can be to us that are by nature born the bond-slaves of sin, corruption, and death; for in that respect, our natural spirits are of a blockish and dull sense, and therefore we cannot abhor misery and death, with that quick sense and feeling, as the pure constitution of Christs humane nature might, and did do; and therefore wee cannot cry out with such a deep sense of it, as hee did.

3 In obedience to Gods declared Decree, in *Gen.* 3.15. and in obedience to his own Covenant to enter the Lists with Satan, with his humane nature, as it was accompanied with our infirmities; It behoved his divine nature to rest and to leave his humane nature to feel the power of Satans enmity, because it was now the very appointed hour for the powers of darkness to exercise their utmost enmity, according to Gods declaration in *Gen.* 3.15.

So then the operation of his divine nature in this appointed hour, was to withdraw assistance from his humane nature, and not to protect it as it did at other times, but to leave his humane nature alone in the combate, and to let the Prince of darkness have his full liberty to disturb his patience, and so to pervert his obedience, if he could, or in case he could not prevail, then it was agreed that these trials should be for the consecration of him, as of the Priest and Prince of our salvation to his sacrifice.

And to this sense do the Ancient Divines speak:

1 The Passion of Christ, saith *Austin*, was the sweet sleep of his Divinity.

Mr. *Rich. Ward* in his Commentary on *Mat.* 27.42. doth thus paraphrase on these words of *Austin*; As in a sweet sleep (saith he) the soul is not departed, though the operations thereof be for a time suspended; so during the time of Christs sufferings, his God-head rested as it were in a sweet sleep, that so the humanity might suffer in all points according to Gods Decree; and to this sense also doth Mr. *Perkins* speak on the Creed, fol. 122.

2 *Theo-*

2. Thomas on Psalm 22. saith, Christ called that a dereliction which was a permission of the Divinity that the humanity should suffer.

3. *Isychius* in Levit. 5. ch. 16. saith, Christ Deity is said to depart by withdrawing his own power from his Humanity, that he might give time to his passion.

4. The blasters of the sentences, saith, the Divine nature did forsake the humane nature. First, By not protecting it. And secondly, By withdrawing his power that so he might suffer. And saith he, in *lib. 3. dist. 2.* the Deity severed it self because it withdrew protection. And (secondly, saith he) it separated it self outwardly not to defend, but it failed not inwardly to continue the union. If (saith he) it had not withdrawn but exercised power, Christ could not have died.

5. *Les de passi Dom. Ser.* 170. saith, That the Lord should be delivered to his passion, it was his Fathers will as well as his own, That not onely the Father might leave him, but that after a sort he should forsake himself, not by any fearful shrinking but by a voluntary cession (or cessing) for the power of Christ crucified contained it self from these wicked ones, and to perform his secret disposition he would not use any manifest power, he that came to destroy death and the author of death, how should he have saved sinners, if he would have resisted his pursuers.

Ibidem, Christ (saith he) cried with a loud voyce, *Why hast thou forsaken me?* that he might make it manifest to all for what cause he ought not to be delivered nor defended, but to be left into the hands of his persecutors, which was to be made the Saviour of the world, and the redeemer of all men, not by any miserable necessity, but of mercy; not for lack of help, but of purpose to die for us.

Ibidem, And saith he, Let us leave this to the Jews, to think that Christ was forsaken of God, on whom they could execute their rage with such wickedness, who most sacrilegiously deriding him, said, *He saved others himself in cannot save.*

These last words of *Les* do most fitly agree to the Prophecy of *Isa.* in chap. 53. 4. there *Isa.* foretold the Jews, that though Christ did manifest the power of his God-head in healing sickness, and carrying away their manifold infirmities from them,

yet

yet not of Satans malice they would esteem him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted, namely in Gods anger for his own sins; and thus the Prophet doth blame their gross mistake by imputing his sufferings to be from Gods wrath for his own desert.

And thus much I think is sufficient to demonstrate the reason why the Divine nature did forsake the Humane, and why the Humane nature propounded this Query with a loud voyce, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me*, It was, that so the humane nature might suffer all that was written of him from his Combatter Satan, according to Gods declared Decree, in *Gen.* 3. 15.

SECT. 3.

Question III.

How did God not forsake Christ on the Cross?

Reply 1. IN two respects God did not forsake Christ on the Cross.

1 He did not forsake his soul in respect of the comfortable fruition of the sense of the good of the promises.

2 He did not forsake him in the formality of his death, namely, he did not suffer Satan and his Instruments to put him to death formally by the power of their tortures.

First, I say that God did not forsake Christs soul in respect of the sense of the good of the Promises.

And for the better understanding of the word *Forsaken*, in *Matth.* 27. 46.

Consider these six sorts of Derelict̃ion.

1 By dis-union of person.

2 By loss of Grace.

3 By diminution or weakening of Grace.

4 In respect of assurance of future deliverance.

5 By withdrawing protection.

6 By depriving his soul of the sense of the good of the promises.

Divines

Divines do generally account it a most impious thing to affirm that Christ was forsaken of God, any of the four first waies.

1 They affirm that God did not forsake Christ in respect of union, they affirm that the personal union of the two natures was never dissolved.

2 They affirm that he was never forsaken in respect of the loss of Grace.

3 They do generally affirm, That he was not forsaken in respect of diminishing or weakening of any grace in him.

The Geneva note on the word *Forsaken*, in Psa. 22. 1. doth make Christ a sinner inherently.

But yet some there are that do affirm that he was forsaken by diminishing or weakening of the Grace of Faith in him; The *Geneva* note on the word *forsaken*, *Psa.* 22. 1. saith thus, Here appeareth that horrible conflict that he suffered between faith and desparation, Is not this a blasphemous note, to say that Christ was in a conflict with desparation through the weakness of faith? is not this an imputation of inherent sin to Christ?

Mr. *Norton* tels me in p. 215. that the Geneva note which I there cited with approbation to the sense of the Dialogue, must not be understood in the Dialogues sense, but it must be interpreted according to the Doctrine of *Geneva*; I would fain see how he by the Doctrine of *Geneva* can make a good exposition of this note affixed to *Psal.* 22. 1. if he mean by the Doctrine of *Geneva*, the Doctrine of *Calvin*, then I find in *Marlorat* on *Mat.* 27. 46. where he cites *Calvins* words on the word *forsaken*, thus, He fought with desparation, yet was he not overcome thereby; this Doctrine of *Calvin* and the *Geneva* note agree together, and therefore in likelihood that *Geneva* note was taken from *Calvin* at first, though his latter Editions are now somewhat reformed; and Mr. *Norton* himself doth censure *Calvin* to be unsound in this point, for in pag. 61. he blames *Calvin* for saying, that Christ suffered the pains of the damned and forsaken men.

Now if Christ was in a horrible conflict between faith and desparation, as the *Geneva* note speaks, then it follows that he was a sinner inherently, for if there be any conflict with doubting (which is less than desparation) it is a sin, *Mark.* 14. 31. *Jam.* 1. 6, 7. *Matth.* 21. 21.

Truly it is a lamentable thing that this note hath been printed and dispersed in so many thousand Bibles to corrupt mens minds, so that now many can hardly have patience to hear any reasons to the contrary; but I must needs acknowledge that our larger Annotation on *Psal.*22.1. hath made a good Reformation.

4 Divines confess that it was not possible that Christ should be forsaken in respect of assurance of future deliverance and present support because he had faith in the full Sea without any ebb.

5 That Christ was forsaken by Gods withdrawing of outward protection (and not delivering of him from the rage of Satan and his Instruments untill they had executed on him all their rage) is acknowledged by the Dialogue, and by many Orthodox lately cited.

6 The last sort of forsaking is that which is affirmed by Mr. *Norton*, namely, *That God forsook Christs soul in anger, as concerning the fruition and sense of the good of the promises.* But in Chap.4. I have shewed that he doth oftentimes leave out the word sense, and makes Christ to be forsaken concerning the fruition of the good of the promise. And this last kind of *forsaking* is suitable to his main Tenent, laid down in his foundation-Propositon.

Reply 13. This last kind of forsaking as it is asserted by Mr. *Norton*, is opposed by sundry eminent Divines.

1 By Mr. *Robert Wilmot*, whom I have cited before in this Chapter at Reply 9.

2 Our large Annotation on *Psal.*22.1. which I have cited at Reply 4.

3 I cited Mr *Robert Smith*, and divers others, at Reply 9.

Christ was not so forsaken in his soul, but that he still had the sweet sence of the good of the promises on the Cross.

4 I will now examine the word *forsaken*, once more with the context, for doubtless that is a sure Rule of a right interpretation.

1 Christ doth interrogate in *Psal.*22.1. *Why hast thou forsaken me?* Is there not good reason that the Divine nature should forsake the Humane, in respect of outward protection? as I have shewed in Answer to the second Question, but yet he did not

not forsake the inward man by any weakning of Grace, nor in respect of the comfort of that Grace; and this is evident by what I have cited in my Answer to the first Question from v.11. and 19. And also I shall now add another reason by conferring it with v.24. There Christ doth exhort all the seed of *Jacob* to praise God, *he hath not hid* (or turned away) *his face from him.* Hence it follows by good consequence, that when Christ said, *my God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* he could not mean that God had hid (or turned away) his face from his immortal soul, for then he could not have exhorted the seed of *Jacob* to praise God, because *he had not hid* (or turned away) *his face from him*; This very Argument is also used by our larger Annotation, on *Psal.*22.1. though I did not see it, till I had first made use of it for this exposition.

2 Seeing it is generally acknowledged that Christ was not forsaken in regard of any diminution of Grace; Thence it follows that these words, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* must not be understood of any inward forsaking of his soul, for (saith Mr. *Rutherford*) these words, *My God, my God*, was spoken with the greatest Faith that ever was, a doubled act of beleeving, *My God, my God.* In Christs dying p.150.

2 Saith he, It is a word relative to the Covenant between the Father and the Son: *My God* (saith he) is a Covenant expression, that the Father will keep what he hath promised to his Son, and relateth to the infinite faithfulness of the Covenant maker.

Object. But here it will be objected as it was about Mr. *Calvins* words, *That Mr.* Rutherford *held, That Christ suffered the pain of loss in his soul.*

Answ. I grant it, yet I say also that that Tenent, and these expressions do cross one another.

4 I do once more propound to consideration what I have cited afore out of Mr. *Wilmot*, at Reply 9. and in Sect.4. And to that I will adjoyn a fourth Argument from him, from his Exposition of the word *always*, in *Act.*2.25. where Christ saith thus, *I foresaw the Lord always before my face.*

Always, that is saith Mr. *Wilmot*, Even in his forest Agonies.

1 Before his sweaty Agony his soul was troubled, yet then he called God Father, *Joh.* 12.27.

2 When he was in the Agony, he could still call God Father, *Luk.*22.44. and prayed to him by the name Father: And in *Joh.*11.42. he said, he knew God heard him always, and therefore even then he must needs have comfort.

3 When he began to be ἀδημονῶν, most grievously tormented περίλυπος i. περιωδὰς λυπῆς, abundantly sorrowful, or rounded about with sorrow, yet then he could still call God Father, *Matth.*26.37.38,39.42.

4 When the betrayer was come, and the Band had seized on him, yet then also he uttered words of sure comfort and confidence, in *Matth.*26.53. *Thinkest thou that I cannot pray to my Father, and he shall set before me more than Twelve Legions of Angels.*

5 When he was upon the Cross, and cryed, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* doth not the very fore-front of that speech ascertain us, that he had even then comfort in his God? *Matth.*27.46.

6 Had not he strong comfort in God his Father at the giving up of the Ghost, when he said, *Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit?* *Luk.*23 46.

If then through all his sufferings he could pray to his father, as we see; and knew his Father heard him ever; yea, even through all his sufferings he called him by this fiducial and cordial name Father, we cannot imagine but that he conceived and applied the comfort contained in the name, when ever he did mention the name; else how conceive we that his heart and mouth did go together. Thus far Mr. *Wilmot.* This I have cited before in Chap.16. But it is never a whit too often to the considerate.

5 Seeing it is acknowledged that Christ was not forsaken in regard of any diminution of Grace, but that he did always injoy his Graces in fulness, even as the Sun in its strength; How could he lose the light of Gods countenance, or want the sense of the good of the Promises, seeing he injoyed the full exercise of all Grace?

He was annointed with the oyl of gladness above his fellows, Psa.47.7.

and

and above measure, *Joh.*3.34. That is, saith Mr. *Ball*, he had the whole Spirit; all the gifts of the Holy Spirit in higher degree than any creature, men or Angels; in full abundance, for he that giveth bountifully or largely, doth not measure or number what he giveth, but poureth out copiously, or as we say, from the full heap with both hands. And in pag. 111. (saith he) fulness without measure, is like the fulness of the light of the Sun, or like the water in the Sea, which hath an unmeasurable sufficiency and redundancy. And therefore hence it follows, That seeing the oyle of gladness was alwaies in him, in the highest fulness without measure, and without the least diminution, that he could not possible be deprived of the sense of the good of the Promises, in respect of his inward man, though he might be, and was deprived of outward protection from the hands of Satan and his Instruments, because it was so Decreed, Covenanted, and Declared in *Gen.*3.15. And therefore, it behoved the Divine nature to withdraw its protection, and to leave him to try masteries with his Combater, Satan, in his Humane nature, as it was accompanied with our true natural infirmities, that so he might suffer from his Combater Satan, all that was written of him in *Gen.*3.15. In the Covenant p. 310.

But this weakness of his (saith *Austin*) was power, because the Divine nature did exercise power to leave his Humane nature, that so his Human nature might suffer in obedience to his Covenant.

But this is also to be well marked, that when the divine nature rested, or ceased to protect and assist the humane nature, it did no way withdraw the exercise of his inward graces, which he had received at his Incarnation, and at his Baptism from the unction of the holy Spirit, above measure (as I noted before) by which his soul was supported under all his greatest tortures on the Cross; and therefore as *Stephen*, and many other Martyrs, had the joyful vision of Gods countenance, and the sense of the good of the promises to support their inward man, under their greatest outward tortures, so had Christ; though all of them wanted the vision of outward protection as well as Christ, and in that respect they might all say, as Christ said, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* And as *John*

In Fox tom. 1. p 50, & tom. 2. p. 130.

Hus and *Amond de laroy* said, as I have noted it in the Dialogue, p. 58.

In the conflict (saith *Ball* on the Covenant, pag. 284.) his Faith was most firm, not shaken with any degree of unbeleef.

And saith Dr. *Sibs* on *Matth.* 27. 46. Christ was not forsaken in regard of Grace, as if Faith, or Love, (or Joy in God) or any other Grace were taken from Christ. O no (saith he) he beleeved when he said, *My God, my God.* Unto these words of his I put in the Grace of Joy in a parenthesis, because he had said before in general, That Christ was not forsaken in regard of Grace, and thence I infer, that then he was not forsaken of the Grace of Joy, in the good of Gods promises (for that is one of the Graces, *Gal.* 5.) no not then when his sufferings were most grievous to his flesh, his Joy in the apprehension of Gods Fatherly love in his promises was not then interrupted, and therefore out of that his never interrupted apprehension, or rather joyful view of the light of Gods countenance, and of the good of his promises, he like a conqueting Combater *indured the cross, and dispised the shame, Heb.* 12. 2.

6 Seeing Christs soul was as full of Grace, as the Sun is full of light, without any eclipse, and as full of Grace, as the Sea is full of water, without any ebb, as it is acknowledged by almost all Divines; how can it be true which Mr. *Norton* affirms, that he was in the spiritual death of his soul when he said, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* For where there is any true Grace, there the soul is spiritually made alive, and therefore true Grace is called the Grace of life, 1 *Pet.* 3. 7. & where the Spirit of God abides, there the soul is in life, and therefore the Spirit of God is called the Spirit of Life, *Rom.* 8. 2. and therefore Christ could not be in the spiritual death of his soul, because he always had the Spirit of Grace in him above measure. Abominable then to God must that doctrine needs be which Mr. *Norton* hath published, that makes Christs soul to be under the power of a spiritual death. Some learned Divines do say, That none can die the second spiritual death in soul, before they die the first death in sin, therefore Mr. *Nortons* Tenent must needs be a Paradox in Divinity, that makes Christs soul to be spiritually dead

dead under the pain of loss and sense; for by that Doctrine, he doth also necessarily make him to be devoid of all Grace, and so consequently to be spiritually dead in sin, which is horrible blasphemy.

2 His Tenent in making Christs soul to be without the comfort of a promise, at the very instant when he made his soul a sacrifice, doth make Christ to be a blemished Priest, and so consequently, it makes his death and sacrifice to be an abomination to God; for a Priest that is a mourner in soul, is a blemished Priest, therefore a Priest must not be a mourner in soul at the time of offering any sacrifice, *Lev.*10.19. & 21.12. for the time of offering sacrifice is a time of procuring Gods Reconciliation, and Gods Reconciliation procured is a matter of rejoycing, *Num.* 12.14. *Lev.*10.19,20. *Deut.*16.11,15. *Neh.*8.9. doubtless therefore all Christs soul-sorrows and sadness in the consideration of Satans ill usage was fully over, as soon as he had done his prayers in the Garden; and yet I grant also, that when he hung upon the Cross he was under most grievous tortures and pains to his senses; but yet I say also, that those pains born with perfect patience did not hinder the sweet sense of his inward joy, that had both conquered Satan and made reconciliation with God, and that now had recovered the Elect, and so had divided the spoil with the strong adversary Satan; which act of dividing the spoil is always done with joy, 1 *Sam.*30.26. *Heb.*12.2. *Isa.*9.3. *Judg.*5.35. *Isa.*53.12. *I will divide*, saith God, *and he shall divide the spoyl with the strong.*

7 Take Mr. *Nortons* words into consideration in p. 89. *Christ* (saith he) *knew that God was his*, Mat.27.46. *fully understood the glory of the blessed, and that his soul presently upon his dissolution should be in Paradice*, Luk.23.43. Doth not Mr. *Norton* in these words prove, that Christ was not totally deprived of the sense of the good of the promises? For now in his greatest torments on the Cross (he saith) he promised paradise to himself, as well as to the penitent theef; and thus at last Mr. *Norton* hath confuted his own Assertion.

SECT.

SECT. 4.

Secondly, *I come now to shew that God did not forsake Christ on the Cross, in the formality of his death.*

Reply 15. I Grant that God by his declared permission to Satan in *Gen.*3.15. did allow him so much power as to pierce Christ in the foot-soals, namely, to crucifie him as a sinful malefactor with the soars of death, just like to other malefactors that were formally killed thereby. But yet for all this, I say also, that God did not give the Devil so much power as to put Christ to death formally, because he had ordained Christ to have a Priestly power, in the formality of his death, by his unchangeable oath, to the end that he might make his death a sacrifice of Reconciliation, according to Covenant. But in case he had been put to death formally by the power of Satan and his Instruments, then his death could not have been a sacrifice (unless he will say that God ordained the Devil to be a Priest) it could have been no more but a death of Martyrdom.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in p. 83.

The Scripture mentioneth no other death then what is inflicted justly for sin.

Reply 16. In this speech *M. Norton* doth much wrong the sense of the blessed Scriptures, for in *Joh.*10.17,18. Christ saith, *This commandement have I received of my Father*, to let none take away my life from me (formally) *but to lay it down* (or as *Tendal* translates it, to put it from me) *of my self*. Hence it is evident that the blessed Scripture doth make a plain difference between the formality of Christs death, and the death of all other men, as I shall more at large expounded this Scripture by and by.

2 His death is called a sacrifice, and none could make it to be a sacrifice but such a Priest as was called of God, to be the Priest, and no other act could make it to be a sacrifice, but such an act of such a Priest as did formally take away the life of the sacrifice.

sacrifice. Therefore he must be the onely Priest in the formality of his own death, *Heb.*9.26,28. & 10.12. and no other mans death is called a sacrifice, formally, but his.

3 All other men die by co-action, because they are sinners in *Adam*, but Christ was no sinner, therefore his death was not co-acted by Gods Justice as other mens is: But his death was a death of Covenant onely, and that Contract and Covenant made it to be the meritorious price of mans redemption. And to this sense I have cited divers Orthodox Divines, in chap.2. and in chap.3. and in chap.16. at Reply 5,10,12. But Mr. *Nortons* foundation-Tenent taken from Court-Justice, namely, that God did legally impute our sins to Christ, hath so beguiled the eyes of his understanding, that he cannot see the difference which the Scripture makes between the formality of Christs death, and the death of other men that are inherent sinners. More easie it is (saith *Origen*) for a man to put off any other customs; how much soever he is affixed to them, than to lay aside his accustomed opinion.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in p. 83.

Mr. Ainsworth, *whom the Dialogue often cites, seemeth to understand death to be laid upon Christ, according to the sense of* Gen.3.19. Gen.3.19.

Reply 17. Mr. *Ainsworth* doth not explain himself touching the manner of Christs death by this verse. But in *Numb.*19.2. he doth thus explain himself; Christ (saith he) was without yoke, as being free from the bondage of sin and corruption, and as doing voluntarily the things appertaining to our redemption: From these words of his, I reason thus; If Christ was free from the yoke of sin and corruption, and did all things voluntarily that appertained to our redemption, then his death was not co-acted by Gods Justice like to the death of all other men, that are sinners; his death therefore must be considered as a voluntary act from the voluntary Covenant; for as he was an absolute Lord in Trinity, so he was a reciprocal Covenanter.

1 To take our nature, and in that nature to enter the Lists

with Satan, and to suffer him to do his worst to provoke his patience, and so to spoil his obedience (as he did *Adams*) if he could.

2 He covenanted that as soon as he had fulfilled his utmost sufferings from his Combater, Satan, hee would send forth his Spirit as the onely Priest in the formality of his own death, that so he might make his death to be a sacrifice of reconciliation for mans Redemption from Satans Head-plot; both these acts of his voluntary obedience he performed exactly according to the Articles of the voluntary and eternal Covenant for the meriting of a great reward; namely, for the meriting of the Spirit for Regeneration; and for the meriting of his Fathers Reconciliation, and eternal Redemption of all the Elect.

But saith the Dialogue, I will distinguish upon the death of Christ, for God appointed him to die a double kind of death, 1. As a Malefactor, 2. As a Mediator, and all this at one and the same time.

1 He died as a Malefactor by Gods determinate Council and Covenant, and to this end, God gave the Devil leave to enter into *Judas* to betray him, and into the Scribes and Pharisees, and *Pontius Pilat* to condemn him, and to do what they could to put him to death (as a cursed Malefactor) and in that respect, God may be truly said to bring him into the dust of death *Gen.* 3.19. as the Dialogue doth open the phrase in *Psa.* 22.15.

2 Notwithstanding all this, Christ died as a Mediator, and therefore his death was not really finished by those torments which he suffered as a Malefactor, for it was his Covenant to be our Mediator in his death, *Heb.* 9.15,16. and therefore he must separate his soul from his body by the power of his God-head (namely, after his Manhood had performed his conflict with Satan) all the Tyrants in the world could not separate his soul from his body, *Joh.* 19.11. no, not by all the torments they could devise, till himself was pleased to actuate his own death, by the joynt concurrence of both his natures.

Mr

Mr. *Norton* in p. 84. doth thus Answer.

The plain meaning of the Author in this distinction is this; Christ died as a Malefactor, onely (though unjustly) in the Jews account, but not as a Mediator; as Mediator onely, in Gods account, but not as a Malefactor.

This distinction (saith he) *in name, but in truth a Sophisme is used as a crutch to support the halting of the non-imputation of the sin to Christ.*

Reply 18. This distinction it seems doth somewhat trouble Mr. *Norton* patience, because it agrees not to his legal courtway of making satisfaction, from Gods judicial imputing our sins to Christ, and from his inflicting Hell torments upon him, from his immediate vindicative wrath, and therefore in contempt he calls it a Sophisme, namely, a false kind of arguing.

2 To the same purpose Mr. *Norton* doth thus repeat another speech of the Dialogue; Christs death as Mediator (saith the distinction) was not really finished by those Torments which he suffered as a Malefactor; the Jews are said to put Christ to death, because they indeavored to put him to death, but did not separate his soul from his body; in that sense they did not put him to death. So (saith he) is the distinction expressly interpreted in the Dialogue p. 100.

Mr. *Norton* in p. 84. doth thus Answer.

If Christs death was a suffering, then the formal cause thereof was not that active separation of his soul from his body, so often mentioned in the Dialogue, otherwise Christ should have been his own afflicter.

Reply 19. I have often warned that the death of Christ is more largely or more strictly taken.

1 The pains of death are often called death in Scripture, though they prove not, in the issue, to be death formally.

2 The Dialogue doth all along affirm that Christs death

was a suffering, and that he was active in his compliance with all his sufferings, for he delivered himself into the hands of Satan and his Instruments, that they might use their best skill to try if by any means they could disturb his patience, and so spoil his obedience (as he did *Adams*) that so hee might put him to death, formally, as he did the other Malefactors.

Christ was often his own afflicter with soul-sorrows.

3. It is also evident that Christ was more intirely active in all his soul-sufferings, than in his outward sufferings, for the Text saith, *He troubled himself at the death of Lazarus*, Joh. 11.33. and he sighed deeply in spirit for their infidelity, *Mark.* 8.12. and so in *Joh.* 13.21. and from hence I infer, that he was his own afflicter very often, as I have shewed more at large in chap. 16. at Reply 10.

See *Beda* in Joh. 11.

And to this purpose I lately cited *Damascen* for Christs voluntary soul-troubles in his Agony.

And unto him I will add *Beda*; Jesus hungred (saith he) it is true, but because he would; he slept, it is true, but because he would; he sorrowed, it is true, but because he would; he died, it is true, but because he would.

Ibidem, The affections of mans infirmity Christ took unto him, not by any bond of necessity, but by the good pleasure of his mercy, as he did flesh, and death it self. Wherefore his death was truly free and not forced, because he had power to lay down his soul, and to take it up again.

From these words of *Beda*, which accord with *Damascen* and other ancient Divines, we may see that they held it to be an evident truth, that Christ was often his own afflicter with soul-sorrows, and to that end he voluntarily took unto him our infirmities of fear, sorrow, &c. they were not pressed from him, from the sense of Gods wrath, as Mr. *Norton* holds.

And saith *Beda*, his death was truly free and not forced, therefore especially in the last act of his death, he was the onely active Priest, in breathing out, or sending out, his soul from his body.

But

But saith Mr. *Norton* in p. 84.

And in this case Christ was his own Executioner, which last (saith he) the Dialogue it self expressly rejecteth.

Reply 20. There is good reason to reject it; for though God commanded Christ in his humane nature (as it was accompanied with our infirmities) to enter the Lists with his envious Combater, Satan, and also permitted Satan to enter the Lists with Christ, and to assault him with a Band of Souldiers with staves and swords, yet he did not command Christ to take any of these weapons from them, and run them into his own body, on purpose to kill himself, that so he might be his own executioner (as *Saul* was, to prevent the ignominious usage of his Adversaries) this kind of killing is Diabolical; and Christ might not be his own executioner in any such like manner; therefore the Dialogue had good reason to reject that kind of Tenent.

Christ was not his own executioner, or self-murderer, though he was the only Priest in the formality of his own death and sacrifice.

The Dialogue saith thus in p. 102. Though he did not break his own body, and pour out his own blood, with nails and spear, as the *Roman* Souldiers did, yet he brake his own body in peeces, by separating his own soul from his body by his own Priestly power; And thus *Beza* makes Christ to break his body actively as well as passively; but it is a prophane expression to compare the act of a Priest in killing a sacrifice, to the act of an executioner that puts a malefactor to death; and it is a like prophane expression to call such a death Self-murder, or Homicide. If *Abraham* had formally killed *Isaack*, as he intended, yet he had not been *Isaacks* murderer, no nor yet his executioner, according to the known use of the word; neither was *Isaack* to be called a Self-murtherer or a Homicide, (being now thirty three years old, and therfore able to have resisted his Father) in submitting himself to be bound, and to be laid on the Altar to be killed: But in that act we see how God esteemed it, for in that act *Abraham* should have been the Priest, and *Isaack* the Sacrifice: And so ought we to esteem of the act of Christ in his death, In his Divine nature he was the Priest, and in his humane nature he was the Sacrifice (as the Dialogue saith)

See *Beza* Annot. on 1 Cor. 11. 24. And *Haymo* there also.

or thus, by the joynt concurrence of both his natures, he was both Priest and Sacrifice.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in p. 84.

Though Haman, *according to the true sense of the Text* Ester 8. 7. *be said to lay his hand upon the Jews, yet are the Jews no where said to be slain by* Haman! *Abraham is said to have offered up* Isaack, *yet* Isaack *is said no where to be slain by* Abraham; *as* Abraham *did sacrifice* Isaack, *so was* Isaack *sacrificed, that is to say, interpretatively, or vertually, not actually.*

Reply 21. Those instances in the Dialogue in p. 100. are more clearly expressed than they are related by Mr. *Norton*, and the intent of those instances was no more but this, namely to exemplifie that though the Jews are said to kill Christ, yet that they did not formally separate his soul from his body (though they did enough to make themselves true murderers of the Lord of life) but the last act was done by himself, as he was the Priest in his own death.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in p. 85.

How oft do we read in Scripture, that Christ was actually crucified and put to death by the Jews? Act. 2. 37. and 4. 10. 1 Cor. 2. 8.

Reply 22. I grant the Scripture doth often say, that the Jews did slay and murder the Lord of life, but saith the *Geneva* note on *Act.* 2. 23. on the word, *you have slain*; The fact is said to be theirs, by whose counsel and egging forward it was done; By this note it appeareth that in their judgement, Christ was not actually put to death by the Jews, but vertually onely; and so *Isaack* is said to have been offered up by *Abraham* in the Preter-tense (so the new Translation in *Jam.* 2. 21.) because he did really intend and endeavor to do it. So then, I hope the Dialogue saith true notwithstanding Mr. *Norton*'s bolling contradiction; namely, that the Jews did not put Christ to death formally. But in case he was put to death formally by second

causes,

cauſes, then it follows, that it was done by the Devil in the *Roman* powers, for they had the power of life and death at this time, and not the *Jews*, as I have ſhewed at large in the Dialogues; the *Jews* and *Romans* were true murtherers, but not the Prieſt in the formality of Chriſts death and ſacrifice: This diſtinction of his death is contemned by Mr. *Norton*.

But it is a very harſh ſaying in mine ears to ſay, That the Devil in the *Roman* powers, was the Prieſt in the formality of Chriſts death and ſacrifice, as they muſt bee, if they were the formal cauſe of Chriſts death; and to me it is as hard a ſpeech to ſay, That the wrath of God the Father, was the formal cauſe of Chriſts death, as ſome ſay it was, and as Mr. *Norton* ſaith alſo, ſometimes in true effect; for in page 79, he ſaith, That Chriſts death was joyned with th curſe made up of the pain of ſenſe, and the pain of loſs; and in page 70, he ſaith, It is a fiction to aſſert any divine prediction, That Chriſt ſhould only ſuffer a bodily death, and preſently after he ſaith, Chriſt dyed as a ſinner imputatively preſſed under the ſenſe of the wrath of God, and conflicting with eternal death.

Hence I reaſon thus; If the wrath of God the Father, did put Chriſt to death formally, then the Father was the Prieſt in the death and ſacrifice of Chriſt, which is quite contrary to Gods own eſtabliſhed order; for by his oath hee made Chriſt an unchangeable Prieſt, that ſo hee might bee the only Prieſt in the formality of his own death and ſacrifice, *Heb.* 7.21.

Chriſt was not by nature obnoxious to death, nor to any other miſery, but by Covenant only, and therefore ſecond cauſes could not further work his miſery and death, than he gave way to, according to his own voluntary Covenant; he covenanted to take our nature and infirmities, and in that nature to enter the Liſts with Satan, and that Satan ſhould have full liberty to do to him all the miſchief that he could, even to the peirſing of him in the foot-ſoals; but he alſo covenanted, that no man nor power of Satan ſhould take his life from him formally, but that himſelf would be the only Prieſt in the formality of his own death, and according to this Covenant, God commanded him to lay down his own life, and to take it up again, *Joh.* 10. 17, 18.

But the main Argument of the Dialogue M. *Norton* passeth over, & never speaks to it first or last; which is this, He that takes away the life of a Sacrifice, must be a Priest; but the death of Christ, was a Sacrifice, therefore he that takes away his life formally, must be the Priest. Hence the Dialogue infers, that the Roman Souldiers did not take away his life formally, because they were Executioners, rather than Priests; neither did his Fathers wrath take away his life formally, because he was not the Priest, and none was ordained to be the Priest but Christ himself, and therefore none but he must take away his life formally. Mr. *Norton* should have answered this Argument, but he passeth by this, and pleads that Christs suffering of the essential curse of Hell-torments, was full satisfaction, and thence he must also hold, that Hell-torments did put Christ to death formally, for there is no satisfaction without the formality of Christs death, *Heb.*9.25. *Rom.*5.10.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 169.

It is a daring Assertion, when there is not one Text, nor (I beleeve) one Classical Author, who affirmeth, that Christ, as the next and formal cause shed his blood; but on the contrary, plentiful Texts and Testimonies, that he was put to death, killed, and slain, and that by the Jews, *Luke* 18,33. 1 *Pet.*3.18. *Mar.*12.8. *Act.* 3.15. 1 *Thess.*3.15. *Jam.*5.6. *Act.*2.23. *Rev.*5.6. 9,12. and 6,9. *to contradict not only the godly, whether learned, or unlearned, both of the present, and all past Generations since the Passion of our Lord Jesus: But also the Scriptures themselves in saying, The* Jews *did not actually put Christ to death.*

Reply 23. I have shewed immediately afore, that though the Scriptures do charge the *Jews*, with murthering the Lord of life, yet that Christ was not actually put to death by their power, and so saith the *Geneva* Note on *Act.*2.23.

2 I will now cite a Jury of Classical Authors, some ancient, and some later, that concur with the Dialogue, That Christ was the only Priest in the formality of his Death, and Sacrifice.

1 *Athe-*

1 *Athanasius cont. Arianos, Orat.* 4. saith,

To have power to lay down his soul when he would, and to take it again, this is not the property of men, but it is the power of the Son of God; for no man dyeth by his own power, but by necessity of nature, and that against his will; but Christ being God, had it in his own power to separate his soul from his body, and to resume the same again when hee would.

2 *Origen* in *Joh. Tom.* 9. saith,

Doth not the Lord affirm a thing that was singular to him above all that ever were in the flesh, when he saith, *None taketh my soul from me, but I lay it down of my self, and have power to lay it down, and power to take it again?* Let us consider what he meaneth, who left his body and departed from it without any way-leading to death: This neither *Moses*, nor any of the Patriarchs, Prophets, or Apostles did say, besides Jesus, for if Christ had dyed as the Theeves did that were crucified with him, he could not have said, That he laid down his soul of himself, but after the manner of such as dye; but now Jesus crying with a strong voyce, gave up the ghost, and as a King left his body, his power greatly appeared in this, that at his own free power and will leaving his body, he dyed. Joh. 10. 17, 18.

3 *Gregory Nyssenus de Resur. Chr. Orat.* 1. saith,

Remember the Lords words what he pronounceth of himself, of whom dependeth all power, how with full and sovereign power, and not by necessity of nature, he severed his soul from his body, as he said, *None taketh my soul from me, but I lay it down of my self, I have power to lay it down, and power to take it up again.*

4 *Tertullian de Resur. carnis cap.* 48. saith thus,

The Lord, though he carried about a soul fearing unto death, yet not falling by death.

5 *Jerom* in *Mar.* 15. saith,

With a faint voyce, or rather speechless, we dye that are of the earth, but he which came from heaven, breathed out his soul with a loud voyce.

Ibid. ad Hedibiam, Q. 8.

Wee must say it was a shew of his divine power to lay down his soul when he would, and to take it again; yea the Centurion

hearing him say, *Father into thy hands I commend my spirit*, and streight way, of his own accord, to send forth his spirit, moved with the greatness of this wonder, said, *Truly this was the Son of God.*

6 *Chrysostome* in *Mat.* 27. *Homil.* 89. saith,

Therefore Christ cryed with a loud voyce, that hee might shew this to be done by his own power: *Mark* saith, That *Pilate* marvelled if he were already dead, and the Centurion also therefore chiefly believed, because he saw Christ dye of his own accord and power.

7 *Victor* of *Antioch* in *Mat.* 15. saith,

By so doing, the Lord Jesus doth plainly declare, that he had his whole life and death in his own free power; wherefore *Mark* saith, that *Pilate*, not without admiration, asked if Christ were already dead (he addeth likewise) that the Centurion chiefly for that reason believed, because hee saw Christ give up the ghost with a loud cry, and signification of great power.

8 *Leo* in *Ser.* 17. *de Pasti Domini*, saith,

What intreaty for life shall wee think was there, where the soul was both sent out with power, and recalled with power.

9 *Fulgentius ad Trasimundum lib.* 3. saith,

Where then the man Christ received so much power that he might lay down his soul when he would, and take it again when he would, how great power might the God-head of Christ have? And therefore the manhood of Christ had power to lay down his soul, because the divine power admitted him into the unity of person.

10 *Nonius* in his Paraphrase on *John*, on these words, *None taketh my soul from me*, saith,

No birth-Law taketh my soul from me, no incroaching time that tameth all things, nor necessity, which is unchangeable counsel; but ruler of my self, I of my own accord yeeld up my willing soul.

11 *Bede* on these words in *Matth.* 27. *And Jesus crying with a loud voyce sent forth the Spirit*, saith,

In that the Evangelist saith, Christ sent out his Spirit, he sheweth, it is a point of Divine power to send out the soul;

was

As Christ himself said, *None can take my soul from me.*

Ibid. In *Mark.* 15. he saith, For none hath power to send out the soul, but he that is the Creator of soules.

12 *Theophilact* in *Matth.* 27. saith.

Jesus cryed with a loud voyce, that we should know it was true which he said, *I have power to lay down my soul*; for not constrained, but of his own accord he dismissed his soul.

Ibid. Saith he, in *Mar.* 15. The Centurion seeing that he breathed out his soul so like a Commander of death, wondered, and confessed him.

Ibid. Saith he, in *Luk.* 23. for he died not like other men, but as a Master of death.

13 *Lyra* in *Matt.* 27. on these words, *Jesus crying again with a loud voyce, sent forth his soul*, saith,

Whereby it appeareth that voyce was not natural but miraculous. Because a man afflicted with great and long torment, and through such affliction near unto death, could not so cry by any strength of nature.

14 *Austin de Tri. lib.* 4. *c.* 13. saith,

It is the death of the Spirit to be forsaken of God, as it is the death of the body to be forsaken of the Spirit; and this is the punishment in the death of the body, that the spirit because it willingly forsook God, should unwillingly leave the body; neither can the spirit leave the body when it will, unless it offer some violent death to the body. The Spirit of the Mediator did plainly prove, that he came to the death of his flesh by no punishment of sin, in that he forsook not his flesh by any means against his will, but *quia voluit, quando voluit, quamdo voluit*, *Because he would, when he would, and as he would.* Therefore he said, I have power to lay down my soul, and power to take it again, no man taketh it from me, but I have power to lay it down of my self; and this those that were present greatly marvelled at, as the Gospel observeth, when after that loud voyce he presently gave up the Ghost, for they that were fastened to the tree were tormented with a long death; wherefore the two Theeves had their legs broken that they might die; but Christ was wondered at because he was found dead, which thing we read *Pilat* marvelled at, when Christs body was asked of him to be buried.

Three things are remarkable in these words of *Austin*.

1 That the death of the body was inflicted on all mankind for the punishment of sin, in which death, the soul must depart from the body against her will, and not when she would, or as she would.

2 That the manner of Christs death was clean contrary to ours, because he gave up his spirit by his own accord and power, when he would, and as he would.

3 That his giving up the Ghost so presently upon his loud prayer, was wondered at by the standers by, and by *Pilat* himself when he heard it.

15 *Bernard Feria 4. Hebd. penose*, saith,

Christ alone had power to lay down his soul, none took it from him, bowing his dead, being obedient to the death he gave up the Ghost; who can so easily sleep when he will? To die, is a great infirmity, but so to die, was plainly an exceeding power; he onely had power to lay down his soul, who onely had like free power to take it again, having the rule of life and death.

16 *Ambros De Incar. Dom. Sacram. c.* 5. saith,

Christ having power in himself to lay aside his body, and take it again; he sent forth his soul, he lost it not.

17 *Eusebius Demon. Evangel. l. c.* 8. saith,

When no man had power over Christs soul, he himself, of his own accord laid it down for man.

Ibidem lib. 3. *ch.* 6.

So loosed from all force, and Resting free, himself of himself, made the departure from his body.

18 *Erasmus in his Paraphrase* in Luk. 23. saith,

Jesus, when with a mighty cry he had said, *Father into thy hands I commend my spirit*; breathed out his soul to make it manifest to all, that he did not faint as others do, the strength of his body by little and little decaying; but streightway upon a strong cry, and words distinctly pronounced, he laid down his life, as of his own accord.

Ibid. in *Mark.* 15. When the Centurion that stood over right as a Minister and Witness of his death, and had seen many dye with punishment; when hee saw Jesus, besides the manner of other men, after a strong cry, presently to breath out

out his soul, said, *Truly this man was the Son of God.*

19 *Musculus* in *Matth.* 27. saith,

That Christ sending forth his soul with a loud voyce, is a proof of a greater power, than may be found in a man dying, whereby he sheweth that he laid off his soul of his own accord, answerable to that, *I have power to lay down my soul and to take it again*; to which end *John* saith, *that bowing his head he gave up the Ghost*; others first die, and then their heads fall; but he first layeth down his head, and then of his own accord delivereth up his soul to his Father.

20 *Gualter* in *Joh.* 6. 9. saith,

But let us see the manner of Christs death, who as *John* writeth with bowing down his head yeelded up the spirit; *Luke* saith, *he cried with a loud voyce, Father into thy hands I commend my spirit.* Here find we manifest Arguments of his Divinity, which the Centurion and others observed, as some of the Evangelists witness.

1 That cry and distinct pronouncing of his last words, sheweth a power and vertue more than humane, for we know that men dying, so faint that most of them cannot speak, be it never so softly.

2 He dieth when he will of himself, yea, and layeth off his soul with authority, to shew himself Lord of life and death, which is an evident proof of his divine power.

21 *Marlorat* on these words in *Matth.* 27. *Jesus crying again with a loud voyce, sent forth his spirit*, saith,

Christ declareth his Majesty, in that he layeth down his soul, not when men constrain him, but when himself will, whereupon *Pilat* marvelled that Christ was so soon dead; and the Lord himself said, *None taketh my soul from me, but I lay it down of my self, I have power to lay it down, and power to take it again*; to which it appertaineth, that is written, *he bowing his head gave up his spirit.* For other men first die, and then their heads hang, but Christ first laid down his head, and then voluntarily rendred his soul into the hands of his father.

22 Mr. *Nichols* cited in the Dialogue pag. 101, speaks pertinently to the judgements of these Divines, and cites *Austin* concurring with him.

23 Mr. *John Smith* of *Clavering* in his grounds of Religion, pag. 59. asketh this Question, *How did Christ die?*

Ans. He dyed not with extremity of pain as others do; but he willingly yeelded up his life, when he could have lived longer if he would, *Job.* 10. 18.

24 Dr. *Ames* in his Marrow on the death of Christ, c. 22. comes near unto the former, for in Sect. 27. he saith, That Christs death was in a certain manner supernatural and miraculous, because Christ did keep his life and strength as long as he would, and when he would he laid it down *Job.* 10. 18. And in Sect. 2. he saith it was an act, and not a meer suffering, &c. out of power, and not out of infirmity onely.

25 *Calvin* on *Job* 10. 18. saith, These words may be expounded two manner of wayes. First, That either Christ putteth his life from him, himself remaining perfect, as if a man should put off his cloathes. Or else secondly, That he died of his own accord.

The first of these two ways is active, and the similitude, as if a man put off his cloaths, I conceive is borrowed either from *Austin* or from *Bernard*, for both of them use this similitude, to set out the active separating of the soul of Christ from his body.

26 *John White* of *Dorchester*, in his Way to the Tree of Life, page 186. saith at lastly, When he was nailed to the Cross, hee voluntarily breathed out his soul into the bosom of his Father, as it is evident, both in that he was dead a good space before the two Theeves that were crucified with him; whereas by reason of the strength of the natural constitution of his body, he might have subsisted under those torments longer than they; and besides, by yeelding up his life when it was yet whole in him, as it evidently appeared by his loud cry, which he uttered at the very instant of his death, as it is testified by *Mar.* 15. 37, 39. and by *Luk.* 23. 46. All which are undeniable evidences of our Saviors voluntary resigning up, and laying down his life, according to the will of his Father, for his peoples sins.

Luk. 23. 46.

And Mr. *Perkins* on the Creed, p. 141. agreeth thus far, That the state and condition of our Saviours body (on the Cross) was

was such, that he might have lived longer; yet saith he, by the Council of God, he must to die at that place, at that time, and at that hour, where and when he died.

And saith the Dialogue in p. 97. The Angel *Gabriel* was sent to tell *Daniel* at the time of the Evening Oblation, that from that very hour to the death of Christ should be 490 yeers exactly cut out, *Dan.* 9. 24.

27 *John Trap* in *Matth.* 27. 46. saith thus,

Jesus cried with a loud voyce, therefore (saith he) he laid down his life at his own pleasure, for by his loud out-cry it appeared, that he could have lived longer if he had listed, for any decay of nature, under those exquisite torments that he suffered in his body, but much greater in his soul.

And saith *Trap* in *Joh.* 19. 33. He took his own time to die, and therefore in vers. 30. It is said, *He bowed his head and gave up the Ghost*; Whereas other men bow not the head until they have given up the Ghost. And (saith he) he cried also with a loud voyce, and dyed; which shewes that hee wanted not strength of nature to have lived longer, if it had pleased him. Job. 19. 33.

28 I might cite the words of Dr. *Williams* to this purpose in his Seven golden Candlesticks, pag. 492. in Quarto. And I could also cite divers others that speak to this effect. But I hope the Judicious will think that these are sufficient to vindicate the Dialogue from Mr. *Norton* over-bold and false charge.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in p. 171.

Such as hold that Christ died of himself, do also hold that Christ made satisfaction by suffering the essential curse, the one opposeth not the other.

Reply 24. I grant that about four or five of the last cited Divines did hold so.

But I say also, that had they been put to answer this Question; Whether did the formality of Christs satisfaction lie in his greatest sufferings before he gave up the Ghost, or in the formality of his death by giving up the Ghost? They would soon

No full satisfaction was made by any thing that Christ suffered before his death was com-

does have answered, That no formality of satisfaction was made by any thing that he suffered, until he gave up the ghost in perfection of obedience, by his own Priestly power; and the reason is plain, because his death must be made a sacrifice for the procuring of Gods attonement, and there can bee no formality of a sacrifice, but by giving up the ghost; or in case any shall deny this Answer, I believe they will intangle themselves in other inconveniences, that they cannot escape, as long as they deny the said Answer.

Sometimes Mr. *Norton* doth place the formality of satisfaction in Christs spiritual death as it accompanied his bodily death, and sometimes contradicts that, and affirms that Christ made full satisfaction by suffering the essential Torments of Hell before he suffered his natural death.

2 I say further, That the one doth most evidently oppose the other, namely, in the formality of satisfaction, for in case Christ had made full and formal satisfaction by suffering the essential Torments of Hell, before his death was compleated, (as Mr. *Norton* doth sometimes most unadvisedly affirm) then the formality of his death and sacrifice, was altogether needless, as to the point of satisfaction, which is high blasphemy to affirm.

Sometimes indeed Mr. *Norton* doth joyn his spiritual death, and his bodily death together, in the point of satisfaction, as if his bodily death was caused by his spiritual death, as in pag. 122, 153, 174, 213, &c. And thus he makes Christ to dye in a cloud, for he makes the soul of Christ to depart out of his body, under the cloud of Gods vindicative wrath, when he said, *Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.*

But in page 92. he doth contradict this, for there he saith, That Christ suffered the essential penal wrath of God, which (saith he) doth answer the suffering of the second death, before he suffered his natural death. And saith he in page 150. Christ offered himself, before his humane nature was dissolved by death.

In both these places you see that he doth hold, That Christ made full satisfaction before he suffered his natural death (for so he doth falsely call the death of Christ) And hence it follows, that he doth most dangerously affirm, that his bodily death in the formality of it was altogether vain and needless, as to the point of satisfaction, as I have once before noted it in Chap. 4. page 79. And saith another learned Divine, This reason drawn from the final cause of Christs sufferings, is most derogatory to the infinit worth of Christs bloody sacrifice.

Oo

On the other hand, when he makes him to dye formally under the immediate vindictive wrath of God; Hee makes the Father to be the Priest in his death and sacrifice, which is quite contrary to his own established order, for he hath established Christ to bee the only Priest in the formality of his own death and sacrifice, by his oath, which is an unalterable thing; for his oath doth witness, that he established Christ by his eternal Decree and Covenant, to be the only Priest in his own death and sacrifice.

I beleeve it will make Mr. *Norton* sweat to get handsomely out of this *Dilemma*, which hee hath brought himself into by his own contradictory principles.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 85, 167, 168.

Wee read in Joh. 10. 18. *that Christ laid down his life, but not that he took it away by violence. The same word that is used here concerning Christ,* Peter *hath concerning himself, I will lay down my life for thy sake,* Joh. 13. 37. *and* John *hath the same concerning Christ and the Saints, because he laid down his life for us, we ought also to lay down our lives for the brethren,* 1 Joh. 3. 16.

Reply 25. I grant that all the godly ought to say to Christ as *Peter* said to him, *I will lay down my life for thy sake*, Joh. 13. 37. and they ought also to say as *John* said in 1 *Joh.* 3. 16. For it is the duty of all the godly to venture their lives as Martyrs for the defence of the truth; and for the defence of the godly that stand for the truth, if they be called thereto, rather than to deny it.

There is a transcendent difference between the manner of *Peters* laying down his life for Christ, and Christs laying down his life as a sacrifice for the redemption of the Elect. Joh 10. 11.

But the death of Christ must be considered, not only as hee was a Martyr from his Combater Satan, but it must also bee considered, as it was ordained to be a Sacrifice of satisfaction (to Gods Justice for mans Redemption) in the formality of it. In the first sense, Christ saith in *Joh.* 10. 11. *I am the good Shepherd, the good Shepherd giveth his life for his sheep*; that is to say, Hee spares not to venture his life to incounter as a voluntary Combater with the proclaimed Enemy (of his elect Sheep.) The old Serpent, according to Gods declared will in *Gen.* 3. 15.

to relieve, as the good Shepherd *David* did, the prey (or the Lamb which was taken for a spoyl) from the Lion, and the Bear, 1 *Sam.* 17.35. *Job* 29.17. And thus Christ gave his life as a Martyr.

2 But in the second sense, his death must be considered as it was to be made a sacrifice of Reconciliation in the formality of it, and so it must be considered as it was effected by his own Priestly power, and in that respect his death is set forth in divers other words in *Job.* 10.17,18. to be of a transcendent nature beyond that voluntary suffering, that is expressed by *Peter*, or by any other Martyr, as it appears by these particulars.

Job 10.17,18.

First, Saith Christ in v.11.& 15 *I lay down my life for my sheep; I am the good Shepherd*, I will not play the Coward to flye when the Wolf cometh to devour my sheep, but I will readily and voluntarily undertake to combate with the Wolf for the redemption of my sheep; I am ready to venture my life in the Combate with the old proclaimed Serpent for the refeuing of my sheep from Satans spoyl, for though I know before hand, by *Gen.* 3.15. that Satan hath an unlimited power given him to do his worst against me, and to use me as a sinful Malefactor, for a time, which time is truly called the hour and power of darkness in *Luke* 22.53. yet like a good Shepherd I will readily enter the Lists with Satan, and will so exactly manage the Combate by my humane nature, for the trial of the Mastery according to the Laws of the Combate, that my death at last, shall not only bee a death of Martyrdome, such as *Peter* speaks of, but over and above, I will make my death in the formality of it, to bee a sacrifice of Reconciliation (according to the eternal Covenant) for the full redemption of all my captivated sheep: I will divide the spoyl with the strong enemy Satan; I will redeem the Elect, though he keep the refuse, and therefore,

Secondly, Christ doth still amplifie the most excellent nature of his death, saying in verse 18. *I lay down my life of my self*, namely, by my own will, desire, and power, according to my voluntary Covenant, for I am a voluntary and equal reciprocal Covenanter, and therefore I must never bee over-ruled by any

any supreme power; but that would destroy the nature of such a voluntary Covenant as mine is.

Thirdly, Christ doth still amplifie the transcendent nature of his death, saying, *None takes my life from me*; and if none (with *Chrysostome*) then surely not death, that sentence of death that was denounced to fusful *Adam* in *Gen.* 3. 19. was denounced as a death to be co-acted by the justice of God for original sin; this kind of death could not take away Christ's life from him; therefore the death of Christ must be considered as a death of Covenant only; it was founded in the voluntary Cauth and Covenant to be performed by himself as a Priest, and to be accepted as a sacrifice of Reconciliation, as the full price of mans Redemption.

But on the contrary, if Christ had been our legal Surety in the same obligation with *Adam*, then God might in justice have taken away his life from him, *volente*, *nolente*, then God might in justice have said to death, Let death seize upon him as upon a guilty Sinner, or as on a guilty Surety, and so death might have exacted his life from him as a true debtor to death by Gods justice, and then his death had been no more but a co-acted natural death, as Mr. *Norton* makes it to be.

But the blessed Scriptures do testifie that Christ in his death did overcome him that had the power of death, *Heb.* 2. 14. and that he triumphed over Principalities and Powers in it, *Col.* 2. 15. The Devil therefore could not put Christ to death formally by his tortures as he doth other men, that are sinners by Gods legal imputation, and therefore Christ said, *None takes my life from me*. Heb. 2. 14. Col. 2. 15.

Fourthly, Christ doth still proceed to amplifie the transcendent nature of his death, saying, *I have power to lay it down*, namely, of my self, as he had expressed his meaning in the former sentence; other men, sometimes have a great desire to dye, and to lay down their lives formally, and yet they cannot dye according to their earnest desire, because they want a power to effect it.

Jonah had a great desire to dye, and yet he had not power to dye, and therefore he prayed unto the Lord, saying, *O Lord, take away my vital soul from me*, Jonah 4. 3. I have a great desire to dye, but yet I cannot dye by my own will, desire, and

power, except I should use some lawful violence against my life.

Elijah also had a great desire to dye, and yet he had not power to dye, and therefore he prayed unto God, saying, *O Lord, take away my vital soul*, 1 King. 19. 4. But Christ had a power to lay down his life of himself, when the appointed hour was come, to make his soul a sacrifice.

Fifthly, Saith Christ, *I have the same power to lay down my vital soul, that I have to take it up again*, and therefore I do compare my power which I have to lay down my life, with my power which I have to take it up again: This (saith *Origen*, (above cited) neither *Moses*, nor any of the Patriarchs, Prophets, or Apostles did say besides Jesus.

Sixthly, Christ doth still make another addition to set forth the transcendent excure of his death, *This Commandment* (saith he) *I have received of my Father*; no other man ever had, or shall have the like positive Commandment to be both Priest and Sacrifice in his own death as I have.

If *Abraham* had offered up *Isaac* in sacrifice by a formal death, yet that Priest and Sacrifice had been in two distinct persons, and so *Isaac* could not have been a compleat Mediator in his death; But saith Christ, It is my Fathers Commandement, that I must bee the Mediator of the New Testament through death, *Heb.* 9. 15, 16. therefore I must be both Priest and Sacrifice in one and the same person, and not in two persons; This peculiar positive Commandement I have received of my Father, it is proper only to my person and office, as I am ordained to be the only Mediator between God and man in my death and sacrifice.

Heb. 9. 15, 16.

Christ (saith Mr. *Ball*) was Lord of his own life, and therefore hee had power to lay it down and take it up; And this power (saith he) he had, not solely by vertue of the hypostatical union, but by vertue of a peculiar Command, Constitution and Designation to that service, *Joh.* 10. 18.

See *Ball* on the Covenant, p. 287.

And saith *Grotius*, The death of Christ was not determined by any Law, but by a special Covenant with his Father; And hence it followes, If there had not been a voluntary Covenant preceding, there could not have been any Commandement used by the first Person over the second Person; and therefore this Com-

See *Grotius* in his War and Peace, part 2. c. 36.

Commandement to lay down his life, must not be understood of a supreme moral Command as Mr. *Norton* understands It, for in page 103. he saith, This act of Christ in laying down his life, was an act of legal obedience. And, saith he, in page 192. For the Mediator to suffer death as our Surety in a way of justice, is an act of legal obedience; But by the Commandement which Christ received from his Father, I understand the Decree of God, that the conditions of the eternal Covenant should effectually be performed, causing such a thing to come to pass effectually, and so God is said to command his own Mercy, and to command his own blessed Promises to come to pass. See *Alms.* in *Psal.* 42. 6. and in *Psal.* 105. 8. and in *Psal.* 133. 3. and in *Gen.* 50. 16. and in *Lev.* 25. 21.

Seventhly, Put these two speeches together, *I lay down my life for my sheep*, Joh. 10. 15. And secondly, *I have power to lay it down, and power to take it up again*, verse 18. and they do plainly shew, that the true nature of my death, is to be considered both as it is a Martyrdome from my malicious Adversary Satan, and as it is a sacrifice in the formality of it by my own Priestly power: And therefore,

Eighthly, In both these considerations my Father doth love me, verse 17. and hee hath testified his loving acceptance both of my person, and of this service of mine.

First, By his own voyce from heaven at my extrinsecal Instalment, *Matth.* 3. 17.

And secondly, At my Transfiguration, when he sent *Moses* and *Elias* to inform my Disciples of my *Departure*, which I should shortly after accomplish by my death at *Jerusalem*; *Then there came a voyce out of the Cloud, saying, This is my well-beloved Son, in whose Combate and Sacrifice, which he is shortly to perform at* Jerusalem, *I am well pleased, satisfied, and reconciled for the redemption of all the Elect*, Luke 9. 31. 35. Luke 9. 31. 35.

These eight Considerations taken from the Text, and laid together, do cleerly evidence, That the manner of Christs laying down his life for his sheep, is of a transcendent nature, to the manner of *Peters* laying down his life in Martyrdome for Christ, though Mr. *Norton* doth most unadvisedly compare the manner of their death to be alike, without making any difference, by which means hee doth beguile both his own soul

and his Answer, of the comfort of the full sense of this blessed Scripture of John 10.17, 18.

And Theod. doth declare his sense of this Scripture by his translation which goes thus; *Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life for me, that I might take it again; no man takes it from me, but I put it away of my self: I have power to put it from me, and power to take it again.*

Hence I gather from this phrase, *I have power to put my life from me*, that he held as the Ancient Divines did, That Christ put his life from him as a man puts off his cloaths; for so the Ancient Divines use the comparison, and saith *Cyril*, *Dereliquit sibi*, without constraint of any; Christ of himself laid down his own soul for us. It is evident, that the Devil and his instruments did use constraint as much as they could devise to force his soul out of his body; But, saith *Cyril*, he laid down his soul for us, not by their constraint, but at his pleasure. And saith *Epiphanius*, *Contra Arianorum Haref.* 69. The Deity together with the soul, did move to forsake the sacred body.

But saith Mr. *Norton* in page 162.

Christ had less strength of nature left to bear his Torments than the Thieves had; Therefore they compelled a man of Cyren to bear his Cross, that is, to help him bear it.

Reply 26. It is granted by the Ancient Divines, that Christ had voluntary weakness, but not necessary weakness of nature by the justice of Gods curse, as sinners have.

2 I have formerly shewed, That Christ was not appointed to combate with Satan and his Instruments by the power of his divine nature, but by his humane nature alone, which he voluntary assumed, together with our true natural infirmities, of grief, fear, sorrow, &c. that so he might be touched with the sensible feeling of our infirmities in all his sufferings from his proclaimed Combater Satan; and therefore for the better manifestation of his said voluntary infirmities (for necessary infirmities as we have, he had none) his God-head put forth a power to withdraw protection from his humane nature, that so

to his humane nature might bee the more sensibly touched at his the feeling of our infirmities.

And wherein I say, That though Christ had this voluntary weakness, yet it did not decay his natural vigor by degrees, as the like sufferings doth decay our sinful natures; for the constitution of his humane nature was so perfectly organized and moulded, that he could at his pleasure take our true humane infirmities, for the accomplishing of his Obedience, according to the Articles of the eternal Covenant, as he did in his Agony in the Garden.

And again, at his pleasure, he could re-assume his perfect strength of nature, as hee did after his prayer in the Garden (such have formerly shewed more at large) he dyed not (saith Mr. Smith of Clevering above cited) with extremity of pains as others do.

And saith Mr. [illegible] of Dorchester, and Mr. Perkins above cited, by reason of the strength of the natural constitution of his body, he might have subsisted under his torments longer than by the two Theeves.

And saith Eusebius (above cited) he did not faint as others do, the strength of his body by little and little decaying.

And saith Mr. Ibbot cited in the Dialogue, page 100. Christ dyed not by degrees as his Saints do; his senses did not decay, no pangs of death took hold upon him, but in perfect sense, patience and obedience, both of body and soul, he did, by his infinite power voluntarily resign his Spirit, as he was praying, into the hands of his Father, without any trembling or haggling, or without any shew of the sense of his pains.

And several others both of the ancient and later Divines, I have immediately cited that speak to this purpose, which proves that Christ had no sufficient weakness to bear his Cross, but voluntary weakness hee had at his pleasure, that hee might bee truly touched with the feeling of our infirmities.

And take also into consideration what Austin saith *de Trinit. lib.* 13. *c.* 14. where he expounds 2 *Cor.* 13. 4. thus, even of that infirmity (wherein Christ was crucified) the Apostle also saith, *The weakness of God is stronger than men*, Whatsoever seemed weakness in Christ (saith he) is so called in comparison of his divine. 2 Cor. 13. 4.

divine power. And again, his weakneſs was ſuch, that it ſurpaſſed the power and ſtrength of us men, and therefore in 1 Cor. 1. 24, 25. Chriſt crucified, is called the power of God, because he was both God and man in one perſon, and therefore as ſoon as he had finiſhed all his ſufferings, wherein he ſhewed his true voluntary weakneſs; hee breathed out his ſoul, even whiles he was in the full ſtrength of nature, by the joynt concurrence of both his natures. To dye, ſaith *Barard*, is a great infirmity, but ſo to dye (ſaith he) is an exceeding power.

1 Cor. 1. 24, 25.

Hence then I conclude, That when the Executioners did compel a man of *Cyrene* to bear his Croſs, that is, to help him bear it: It doth not prove that Chriſt had leſs ſtrength of nature left to bear it than the Theeves had, as Mr. *Norton* doth argue; It proves no more but this, either that Chriſt had voluntary weakneſs, or elſe that they thought him to have ſuch neceſſary weakneſs appertaining to his nature, as other ſinful men have that are over-burdened, for they could not diſcern his voluntary weakneſs, from neceſſary weakneſs, unleſs they had known him to be God and man in one perſon, and therefore they compelled a man of *Cyrene* to help him bear his Croſs; And who can tell but that the Theeves had ſome to help them bear their Croſs as well as Chriſt had? and therefore it is a weak argument to prove that Chriſt had leſs ſtrength of nature to bear his Croſs, than the two Theeves, becauſe they compelled a man of *Cyrene* to help him bear his Croſs; ſeeing the Scripture is ſilent whether the two Theeves did bear their own Croſs, without any help from others.

But ſaith Mr. *Norton* in page 168.

'Tis true, no Tormints, though in themſelves killing, could kill Chriſt until he pleaſed, and it is alſo true, that Torments, killing in themſelves, could kill him when he pleaſed.

And ſaith he in page 86.

Though Chriſt by his abſolute power could have preſerved his life againſt all created adverſary power, Joh. 10. 18. yet (ſaith he) by his limited power he could not; But as our Surety, he was bound

bound to permit the course of Physical causes, and the prevailing power of darkness for the fulfilling of what was written concerning him, Luke 22.53. The Jews therefore doing that which according to the order of second causes, not only might, but also (through his voluntary obliged permission) did take away his life, they did not only endeavour, but also actually kill him, &c.

Reply 27. I have often warned, to have it the better marked, That the death of Christ is set out to us two wayes in the blessed Scriptures.

First, Either more largely by his suffering the pains of death, as a sinful Malefactor from his envious Combater Satan.

Or secondly, more strictly, by setting out the formality of his death, as it was made a sacrifice, when his soul was separated from his body by his own Priestly power.

But Mr. *Norton* is much displeased with this distinction, because it crosseth his Doctrine of Satisfaction, by suffering the essential Torments of Hell, as our legal Surety in the same obligation with *Adam*.

Now in the first sense It is true, That Christ was ordained to be the seed of the sinful deceived woman, and in that nature, as it was accompanied with our true humane infirmities, hee was to combate with our malicious Enemy Satan; and in that respect he must permit the course of Physical causes, and the prevailing power of the Prince of darkness to do him all the mischief he could to provoke his patience, and to disturb him in the course of his obedience according to Gods Declaration of the Combate in *Gen.*3.15.

2 But yet notwithstanding, it is not any where written, that Christ covenanted to let the powers of darkness to take away his life formally: I do not find that Christ had limited himself by his obliged permission to let the *Jews* and *Romans* take away his life actually and formally, as Mr. *Norton* holds: Nay, I say, the blessed Scriptures do plainly deny this, as I have opened *Joh.*10.17,18. in *Reply* 25.

Secondly, It is also further evident, that none but himself was ordained to bee the Priest in the formality of his Death and Sacrifice, because God made him a Priest for ever after

Heb.7.21. the order of *Melchisedech* by an oath, which declares, That according to the eternal Decree, and the unchangeable Council and Covenant of God, he should be the only Priest in the formality of his death and sacrifice; and in that respect Christ saith, *None taketh my vital soul from me, I lay it down of my self. I have power to lay it down, and power to take it up again. This Commandement* Joh.10. 17,18. *have I received of my Father*, Joh.10.17,18.

And hence I reason thus, If Christ received this Commandement from his Father, then doubtless his Father had covenanted, that he should be the only Priest in the formality of his own death and sacrifice, and that he would accept it as the full price of mans Redemption.

3 I have often shewed that Christs humane nature was so perfect, that it was priviledged from our natural death and sufferings; and that his death and sufferings was undertaken only by his voluntary Covenant; and that Covenant made it upon performance according to the Articles, to be the full price of mans Redemption.

These two ways the blessed Scriptures do often speak of the death of Christ. First, Of his passive death.

And secondly, Of his active death: But because his passive death from his malignant Combater Satan, was accompanied with very many ignominious punishments and reproachful Tortures which he was permitted to use, as thinking thereby to provoke his patience, and so to spoil his obedience, that so he might not make his soul a sacrifice: Therefore much Scripture is taken up to record the long story of his passive death, and in that long and sharp trial, his perfect patience and obedience, through all his ignominious sufferings, is much to be admired, especially from the time that he was apprehended to the end of the time of his crucifying, which was twelve full hours, and hee abroad under the pains of a violent death for three hours together; and all the actions that fell in about his sufferings in all this time were many, and therefore the story thereof must needs bee long, and his tenible feeling of our infirmities in all his sufferings, doth not only prove the truth of his humane nature, but the perfection of his patience and obedience; and in that respect his sufferings were ordained to be for the perfection of his Priestly Consecration to his

sacrifice, *Heb.* 2. 10. And therefore as soon as he had finished his Priestly Consecration by suffering the utmost of Satans temptations and trials, he presently after, without delay, made his vital soul a sacrifice by his Priestly power in both his natures, as the formality of all satisfaction for mans Redemption.

Heb. 2. 10. Christs Priestly Consecration. Christs Sacrifice.

But because this short singular act of his sacrifice, was done as it were but in a moment of time, and because it was done in the middest of his sensible torments on the Cross; therefore it comes to pass, that this short singular act of his sacrifice is not so much marked as it ought to bee. But, most all ends, the long obvious story of his sufferings from his Combaters Satan (which indeed doth belong to his sacrifice, as much as the consecration of the Priest doth to the Sacrifice) is named instead of full satisfaction, and so it may be fully called by the figure Synecdoche, provided his sacrifice, in the formality of his death, by his own Priestly power be not neglected: but a real distinction ought to be observed when the parts of Christs Priesthood, are to be explained, though this distinction is often slighted and divided by Mr. *Norton*.

So then from the long passive action, Christ may bee truly said to be killed and slain (for he was crucified with the sores of death) even as truly as it is said that Christ was the Son of *Joseph*: for indeed he was the Son of *Joseph* in a true legal sense, because he was born of *Josephs* wife after Mariage, and in that respect, he was truly and properly, in Laws esteem, the Son of *Joseph*, and accordingly he was every where esteemed, and called the Son of *Joseph*, yea his mother *Mary*, that best knew the truth, told her Son Jesus, that his Father *Joseph* sought after him, *Luke* 2. 48. yea and Jesus himself did also acknowledge *Joseph* to be his true Father, according to Laws esteem, and therefore he was subject to him as to his proper Father, for nine and twenty years together; namely, until he was extrinsecally installed into the Mediators office (and then he had the business of another Father to do) and the world in general (some few excepted) knew no other, but that he was the true natural Son of *Joseph*, and therefore no man did contradict that usual talk and speech; and yet notwithstanding all this plain and downright speaking, Christ was not the true natural Son

of *Joseph*, hee was legally, but not formally the Son of *Joseph*.

So in like sort it may be as truly said, That Christ was killed and slain by the sores of death on the Cross by the *Jews*, because they did as much to kill him, as they did to kill their own Prophets, 1 *Thes.*1.15. yea Christ himself foretold his Disciples that he should be killed by the *Jews*, *Mark.*8.31. *Mark.*12.8. and all the Prophets said, It should be so, *Gen.*3.15. *Psal.*22. *Isa.*53. and the Evangelists said, It was so, *Luke* 24.20. *Act.*3.23. and the Martyrs in *Rev.*5.9,12. said, It was so; and yet in verse 6. they say also that he stood there, as though hee had been killed; both speeches are true, and both are truly affirmed: For first, He was truly killed and slain both by the *Jews*, and by the *Roman* powers, in Laws esteem; and yet the Martyrs said, It was but as though it were so; legally they killed him, but formally they did not kill him (though they did what they could to kill him formally, and they thought they had killed him formally, because he died formally whiles he was under the sores of death) but indeed they could not kill him formally, because God had given power to Christ to lay down his life formally of himself, and that no other created power should take away his life from him, as I have formerly expounded, *Joh.*10.17,18. Himself was ordained to be the only Priest in the formality of his death and sacrifice, as soon as he had fulfilled al the tortures of the Cross from his Combater Satan, but that act of separating his soul from his body, was not so sensible to the beholders as his external tortures of death were, and therefore they thought nothing less was the true cause of his death.

They could not by the power of their natural reason discern how God did interpose his power between the tortures of death, and their ordinary killing effect, neither could they discern the difference that was between his sinless nature, and their own corrupt nature, nor yet how he was God and man in personal union, and therefore they could not know as they ought to have known, how he must be the only Priest in the formality of his own death and sacrifice, and that he must offer himself by his eternal Spirit, that so he might be the Mediator of the New Testament through that kind of Mediatorial death, *Heb.* 9.14,15.

And

And yet this ignorance both of the Jews and Romans did no whit exempt them from being the true murderers of the Lord of life, in as high a degree, as if his God-head had not interposed to hinder their killing power; as we may see by that eminent example of Justice that was done by *Darius* upon such like murderers of *Daniel*, for after that *Darius* was come to the Lyons Den, and perceived that God had interposed his power, between the fierce devouring nature of the ravenous Lyons, and their executive power, and that *Daniel* was not formally killed by them, he did not in that respect excuse *Daniels* accusers from being the true murderers of *Daniel*; but on the contrary, he did adjudge them to be *Daniels* true murderers, and therefore he commanded them to be thrown into the Lyons Den, and to be killed as the true murderers of *Daniel*, as it seem. *Dan.*6.22,23,24. Dan.6. 22,23, 24.

4 In case Mr. *Norton* will still deny this Priestly power to Christ in the formality of his death and sacrifice, then why hath he not hitherto made it evident by Scripture, rightly expounded, how else Christ was the onely Priest in the formality of his death and sacrifice? seeing the Dialogue did give him just occasion to clear this point more fully than as yet he hath done.

I find that some eminent Divines do make his own submission to be put to death formally, by the Devils Instruments, to be his onely priestly act in his sacrifice.

But for the reasons fore-alledged from *Joh.*10.17,18. and from *Heb.*7. and *Heb.*9. 14,15,16. It is still evident to me that his act of submission to be put to death by the Devils Instruments, is not sufficient to demonstrate his active priestly power, and authority, for the making of his death to be a mediatorial sacrifice; for then the submission of Martyrs to be put to death by Tyrants, might as well be called their Priestly power to make their lives a sacrifice.

No other act of a Priest doth make a sacrifice but such an act as doth formally take away the life of the sacrifice.

But I have formerly shewed, First, That no other death can properly be called a sacrifice but such a death onely as is formally made by a Priest, namely, by such a Priest as God hath designed for that work.

Secondly, That no other act of that Priest can make it to be a sacrifice formally, but such an act as doth formally take

take away the life of the appointed sacrifice.

Heb. 2. 10. compared with Lev. 8. 30.

5 Saith Mr. Ley on *Heb.* 2. 10. The Priest was first consecrated with oyle, and then with blood; this I do the rather mention for the better consideration of the nature of Christs Consecration to his Priestly Office.

First, He was annointed with the oyl of gladness, when he was first externally installed into the Mediators Office at his Baptism, by the apparition of the Holy Ghost in shape like a Dove, *Matth.* 3.

Secondly, After this he was Consecrated with blood, in all his bloody sufferings, *Heb.* 2. 10, 17. with *Heb.* 5. 9.

6 Every consecrated Priest must have some good thing to offer to the offended party for his reconciliation to the offender, *Heb.* 8. 3. and none knows what good thing will be acceptable to our offended God but himself; and therefore, he onely must both ordain the Priest, and the manner of his consecration, and the good thing that he will accept, and the manner of the offering it.

And therefore it pleased God in the first Covenant to ordain typical Priests that had sinful infirmities, and typical cleansings by the ashes of an Heifer, and by the blood of beasts, for the cleansing and purifying of the flesh from Ceremonial sins: And these beasts he appointed to be, First, of the gentle and harmless kinds, and such as would continue patient under ill usage. Secondly, To be such as were without spot outwardly. And thirdly, To be such as were without blemish inwardly; that so they might be types of the perfection of Christs humane nature, and of his sacrifice, 1 *Pet.* 1. 19. as the onely good things which he had ordained to be offered by his Priestly power, to purge the conscience from all our moral sins and so to bring us again to God, as the Dialogue hath shewed in p. 91, &c. Therefore when he came into the world, he said, *Sacrifice and Offering thou wouldest not have, but a body hast thou prepared me.* God that was offended (knew best what good thing would be most acceptable unto him for the procuring of his reconciliation) prepared a body for Christ that so it might be that worthy thing (that from eternity he had appointed to be offered in the fulness of time.) And therefore in the fulness of time Christ said, *Lo, I come to do thy acceptable will, O God;*

and

and so he took away the first typical Priests and sacrifices, that he might establish the second to stand for ever, Heb. 10. 5, 6, 7, &c.

By which will of God, that is performed by Christ in making his prepared body a sacrifice, we are sanctified or made holy and righteous again, Heb. 10. 10. namely, set into a state of favour, as we were in our first creation; for so we must understand the word *sanctified*, and so the legal phrase in the word [*sanctifieth*] to the purifying of the flesh in vers. 13. doth teach us to carry the sense, and how else did the offering of Christs body (sanctifie or) purge the conscience, as the word is in ver. 14. from dead works (that is to say from original and actual sin?) But because God was pleased to ordain that offering to be the onely meritorious procuring cause of his reconciliation, attonement, pardon and forgiveness; So then is is Gods Attonement so procured, that did sanctifie the sinner or make him holy and righteous in Gods sight, in respect of his state (in relation to Gods favor) even as *Adam* was in his first Creation; and the reason is so plain, that he that is but observant of the typical phrases may run and read it; namely, because originally God created the nature of all mankind in holiness and righteousness, after his own image; for in case *Adam* had but first eaten of the Tree of life, all his children should have been holy, but in case he did first eat of the forbidden fruit, then he and all his posterity should with him forfeit their greative purity, and instead thereof become dead in sin, and so be in a state of enmity with God; but by Gods reconciliation and attonement procured through the sacrifice of Christ all their sins should be forgiven, and so they should be again restored into their former state of holiness and righteousness, namely, into Gods gracious favour again, as *Adam* was in his innocency.

Heb. 10. 10. The word Sanctifie and make holy, in the Law, is often ascribed to Gods atonement and forgiveness procured by sacrifice; and therefore sinners that are so made holy are justified and righteous persons in Gods sight.

And saith *Baxter* to *Maiowen*, p. 181. Is is the same act of God that is called constitutive justification and pardon of sin, so far as Justification is taken as comprehending onely the restoring of us to the happiness that we fell from.

But this I perceive is a Riddle to Mr. *Norton*, for in p. 209. he saith, to be sinless is not enough to make a sinner righteous; but if he will but search better into the Ceremonial Types, he may see that it is Gods forgiveness from his attonement procured

Heb. 9. 13, 14. Lev. 11. 44. Pardon of sin by Gods Attonement, and a sinners righteousness is the same thing, contrary to Mr. Norris long discourse in p. 209, 210, 211, 212, &c.

cured by legal washings, and by the blood of beasts, by which all *Israel* were sanctified or made a holy people again, as the legal phrase doth testifie, in *Heb.* 9. 13. and in *Lev.* 11. 44. and so in *Exod.* 29. 36, 37. to Purifie and Sanctifie are Sinonimous terms; and from these legal phrases the Apostle doth reason thus; *If the blood of Bulls and Goats, and the ashes of an Heifer sprinkling the unclean doth sanctifie, to the purifying of the flesh, Heb* 9. 13. then saith he in v. 14. *How much more shall the blood of Christ purge your conscience from dead works?* in these two verses he compares the force of the word *purge*, with the word *sanctifie*; and therefore these legal phrases do teach us the nature of a sinners Justification in Gods sight, for as their legal washings and cleansings by the blood of beasts, &c. did sanctifie or make their bodies holy, because it procured Gods Attonement for the expiation of their legal sins, by which they were again made fit to have communion with God in his holy Sanctuary, *Lev.* 11. 44. *and* 19. 2. *Num.* 15. 40. *and* 16. 3. *and* 5 1, 2, 3. Even so it must be understood in the typical sense, and therefore as often as Gods holy people were legally defiled, what did God require them to do to make them holy and righteous again? but to observe the Laws of their legal washings, and cleansings, which God ordained on purpose for the procuring of his attonement, pardon and forgiveness, and then they were made holy again, or then they were sanctified to the purifying of their flesh, *Heb* 9. 13. *Lev.* 11. 44. *Numb.* 6. 8, 9, *Deut.* 14. 2, 21. *and* 26. 16, 19, *Exod.* 22. 31. *Lev.* 17. *and* 20. 25, 26. Even so it must bee understood in the typical sense.

But this is needful to be remembred, that this kind of holiness and sanctity by Gods attonement, procured by their legal washings and sacrifices, must be distinguished from that kind of sanctity and holiness that is first wrought in us by Gods Spirit in our Regeneration; For this kind of holiness which we obtain by Gods Reconciliation, Attonement, Pardon and forgiveness, may more fitly be called, The satisfaction of merit.

For first, This satisfaction of merit sets sinners in *statu quo prius*; namely, it sets them by Gods gracious voluntary positive Law and Covenant, into that state of holiness and righteousness which they lost, both in the legal sense by their ceremonial sins, and in the moral sense by *Adams* sin.

Secondly,

Secondly, This is further evident: because the Sin-offering of Attonement in Exod. 30. 10. is translated by the Seventy the blood of the purgation of sins, because in their understanding, Gods attonement procured by their sin-offerings, and the purgation of sins by Gods attonement is all one; and this very phrase of the Seventy, doth *Paul* apply to the merit of Christs sin-offering, saying, by himself he made a purgation for our sins, *Heb.* 1. 3.

Thirdly, On the day of Attonement, the High Priest made Attonement for all *Israel*, *To cleanse them, that they might be clean from all their sins before the Lord*, *Lev.* 16. 30. Mark the phrase, *He made Attonement for their cleansing*; and how did he make Attonement for their cleansing? but by offering their publick Sacrifices by which he procured Gods Attonement, which did formally cleanse them, or sanctifie them, or make them holy from the defilement of all their legal sins; for these legal terms are synonimous, and this did typifie, That it is Gods Reconciliation or Attonement procured by the death and sacrifice of Christ, that doth formally cleanse us from all our moral sins; and by which means onely we are sanctified, *Heb.* 10. 10. or made holy, just, and righteous in Gods sight, as I have opened the matter more at large in 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. Lev. 16. 30.

Fourthly, Saith the Apostle, in *Heb.* 10. 4. It is not possible that the blood of beasts should procure Gods Attonement for the expiation of our moral sins; which kind of arguing of his had not concluded any thing, if the bloody combate of Christ in his sufferings, and his sacrifice by his own Priestly power had not been established by Gods voluntary, positive Law and Covenant, as the onely means to cleanse and purifie the conscience by procuring Gods Attonement for all our moral sins, by the which will of God we are sanctified by the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all, v. 10. And here Mr. *Norton* may see that Gods attonement and forgiveness, is called sanctity and holiness to justification. Heb. 10. 4.

For the self-same gracious will of God that gave efficacy to his first positive Law and Covenant at *Horeb*, for the sanctifying of their polluted flesh by the blood of beasts, *Heb.* 9. 13 gave efficacy to his eternal positive Law and Covenant, by the death of Christ to sanctifie or purifie the polluted conscience

from dead works, and therefore in verse 14. the Apostle doth infer from verse 13. *How much more shall the blood of Christ, who offered himself by his eternal Spirit, purge your conscience from dead works?* (and here it must be noted that the word *Purge* in ver. 14 is of the same force with the comparative word *Sanctifie*, in ver. 13. and with the word *sanctifie* in chap. 10. 10.) and also from this act of Christ in offering himself by his eternal spirit in ver. 14. (namely, both as Priest and sacrifice in one and the same person) he proves in ver. 15, 16. That he was the Mediator of the New Testament in this kind of death, and so by this kind of death, he got the victory over Principalities and Powers (that could not put him to death formally, though they had liberty to do their worst) and spoiled them (as a victorious conqueror, because they could not disturb his patience by all their ill usage) triumphing over them in it, namely, in the priestly formality of his death on the cross, *Col.* 2. 15. and the Roman Centurion confessed in *Mark.* 15. 39. that the formality of his death was not after the manner of other malefactors (of which he had seen many to die) but that it was of a transcendent nature; and therefore with great admiration he said, *Truly this man was the Son of God.*

Col. 2. 15. Mark. 15. 39.

Col. 1. 21, 22. What other death can the Apostle mean did God ordain to reconcile us to God, but the death of his flesh, and not the spiritual death of his immortal soul, as Mr. *Norton* saith?

Fifthly, It is also evident by the New Testament, that Gods Reconciliation or Atonement procured by the death of Christ, doth make believing sinners holy and righteous, as in *Col.* 1. 21, 22. *You that were enemies, he hath now reconciled in the body of his flesh, through death, to present you holy and without blemish, and spotless in his sight* (as *Beza* reads it.) Hence it is evident, that Gods Reconciliation, or his forgiveness by his Reconciliation, doth make a believing sinner not only without blemish, and spotless, but [holy] also: And so the word *sanctifie* and *cleanse* in *Ephes.* 5. 27. is synonimous with the word *holy*, and *without blemish*, in the same verse.

Sixthly, I pray note this also, That the holiness of Christs person cannot be imputed to us for our formal holiness (as it is affirmed by some) unless it could be proved that God doth first make us one with Christ in the personal unity of both his natures, as the Dialogue doth reason the case in p. 146. And so Mr. *Baxter* doth reason with *Molinæus* in p. 183. Christs Righteousness formally (saith he) is incommunicable to any other our

our union with Christ (saith he) makes us not the same person with him, to be the same subject of the same accident, Righteousness. This Section I have added only by way of Parenthesis.

Seventhly, Seeing it is acknowledged that perfection doth consist in action; and seeing it is also acknowledged that the perfection of all Christs obedience was to be evidenced, not only by his perfect patience in all his sufferings from his Combiter, Satan, but especially in the formality of his death and sacrifice, why should it not be formally done by his own priestly action?

And why then doth Mr. *Norton* detract so much from the perfection of his Priestly action, in the formality of his death and sacrifice, by ascribing the formality of it to physical causes onely, as his words repeated a little before do testifie?

But saith Mr. *Norton* in p. 83.

The Scripture mentioneth no other death than what is inflicted justly for sin, &c.

Reply 28. I cannot but wonder that Mr. *Norton* should detract so much from the perfection of Christs Priestly action in making his death to be a sacrifice, as to make it to be nothing else but a co-acted death according to Gods sentence denounced on fallen *Adam*, as the punishment of his original sin in *Gen.* 3. 19. For as *Lupus* saith well, In our death, the body doth in a manner leave the soul, before the soul leaveth the body, For (saith he) it is the body by it self, forsaking life, that causeth the soul to depart. Hence I infer, What perfection of Christs Priestly active obedience can there be in such a kind of forced death, as this is?

But on the other hand, look upon the death of Christ as it was to be made a sacrifice in the formality of it by his own Priestly power, and then we may see it to be a death of Covenant onely, and so consequently to be an active mediatorial death and sacrifice, because he must be our Mediator in his death. But in reply to this I have spoken more fully to this objection.

Therefore for a conclusion, I will yet once more distinguish upon the death of Christ.

1 The long action of his bloody combate with Satan and his Instruments gave the name to his being killed and slain.

2. His last short act in breathing out, sending out, or putting out his immortal spirit, when he cried with a loud voyce, *Father into thy hands I commend my spirit*, gave the name of formality to his death and sacrifice by his own Priestly power.

Luk. 23. 46. When Christ said, *Father into thy hands I commend my spirit*, he did not breath out his soul through the decay of his natural spirits, as the Saints do, when they say the same words, as Psa. 31.5. in *Psal.* 31.5. Nor as *Stephen* did, when he said *Lord Jesus receive my spirit*, *Act.* 7.59. For their death is co-acted by Gods Justice on original sin, *Gen.* 3.19. But Christ made it evident that his death was not co-acted by weakness of Nature, by his crying out with a loud voyce, when he said, *Father into thy hands I commend my spirit*, and at that instant gave up the Ghost; by which loud out-cry he made it evident that he was in full strength of nature when he died, as it is noted before by Mr. *White* of *Dorchester*, and by Mr. *Trap* and others, and this last act gave the formality.

1 To his Obedience.

2 To his Death and Sacrifice.

3 To the price of full satisfaction. For as I have formerly shewed from *Exod.* 30. 12. It was Gods voluntary Covenant that made the half shekels to be the full price, for the redemption of the lives of the *Israelites*; and this price was imployed (or part of it at least) to buy publick Sacrifices, which were ordained to make an Attonement for their lives (as I have opened it in the Dialogue p. 86.) namely, this price was accounted by God to be in the place, and in the stead of their lives, as vers. 15, and 16. doth declare: And thus their lives were redeemed with a price, and yet materially it was not the full price of their lives, but formally it was the full price of their lives, by vertue of Gods free Covenant.

Exod. 30.12, 15, 16. The death of Christ as it was made a sacrifice of reconciliation by the voluntary Covenant between the Trinity, was the full price of mans redemption.

In like sort Gods voluntary Covenant and Decree, made the obedience of Christ in his Combats of sufferings, and in the formality of his death and sacrifice, to be the full price of the redemption of all the elect *Israel* of God, namely, in their place and stead.

But saith Mr. Norton in page 143.

No price can dispence in case of the Antitype.

Reply

Reply 29. And why not? Is God by neceſſity of nature bound to puniſh ſin to the utmoſt extent of his Juſtice? Is not he a Supreme to do with his own what he pleaſeth? The Lord in mercy open his eyes, and all our eyes to ſee better into the ſecret of Gods voluntary Covenant, for it is his voluntary poſitive Law and Covenant, that doth make any thing to bee a full formal price in his own ſight; and on the contrary, that nothing that is never ſo valuable in our eyes, can be made a full price formally in his eſteem, without his voluntary poſitive Law and Covenant, doth concur thereto.

Concluſions from my ſeveral Replyes to the ſaid third Queſtion.

1. Hence it follows, That God did not forſake Chriſt in the formality of his death on the Croſs, namely, he did not ſo forſake him, as to ſuffer his humane nature to be put to death formally by the power of Satans torturing pains, neither did he appoint his death to be made a ſacrifice by his own immediate wrath, but onely by Chriſts own Prieſtly power.

2. Hence it follows, That the death of Chriſt in the formality of it, was accepted of God as a Mediatorial ſacrifice of Reconciliation, by which his wrath was appeaſed, and his favour procured to all poor humbled and beleeving ſinners; he was the Mediator of the New Teſtament through his death, becauſe he compleated the ſame as our Mediatorial Prieſt by the joynt concurrence of both his natures in perſonal union, and in that reſpect, he is denominated to be the Mediator of the New Teſtament, through that tranſcendent kind of death, *Heb.*9.14,15,16.

A brief Reply to Mr. *Nortons* Charge of Hereſie; For out of his Heterodoxal Tenents, he doth charge Hereſie upon the Dialogue.

1. *For denying the Imputation of the ſins of the Elect to Chriſt, and his ſuffering the puniſhment due thereunto, contrary to* 2 Cor. 5.21. Gal.3.13. Iſa.53.5,6.

Reply THe Dialogue doth indeed deny the Imputation of the ſins of the Elect to Chriſt, in that new upſtart formal legal manner (by imputing ſin, and inflicting

sliding punishments after the manner of the proceedings of legal Courts of Justice) as Mr. Norton holds: But it doth not deny but approve of the imputation of the sins of the Elect to Christ, in the sense of the Ancient Divines, and in the sense of Mr. Wotton (for in this point of Imputation, Mr. Wotton follows the sense of the Ancient Divines, and the Dialogue doth approve and follow Mr. Wottons sense (as I have shewed in Chap. 14.) whose memory will be blessed where the truth prevails in this point, namely, That Christ bare our sins in his body on the Tree, as the Dialogue hath rightly expounded, 1 Pet. 2. 24. namely, our punishments (as our voluntary combating Surety against Satan) according to Gods Declaration in Gen. 3. 15. Luke 1. 74. Heb. 2. 14, 15. 1 Joh. 3. 8. and not as our legal bounden Surety in the same obligation with Adam to the first Covenant of works, as Mr. Norton holds.

2 As for the several Scriptures which Mr. Norton hath cited to prove his corrupt sense, I have expounded them in their right sense; with the concurrence of several Orthodox Writers. Therefore you may see that he hath wrested the sense of the blessed Scriptures to prove his corrupt Tenent; therefore his charge of Heresie is but a paper shot, and a deep Charge of Error may justly be retorted.

And whereas hee hath published another book called, The Orthodox Evangelist, wherein he hath asserted the same Tenents upon the same grounds that he hath done in his Answer to the Dialogue: This Reply which I have made in this Book, will serve to prove, that the said high Title, is an erroneous and misleading Title, and therefore it will advise the Reader to search better into the truth.

His second Charge of Heresie runs thus:

For denying that Christ as God-man, Mediator, obeyed the Law, and therewith, that he obeyed it for us as our Surety, contrary to Gal. 4. 4, 5. Mat. 5. 17, 18. Heb. 10. 7. *compared with* Psal. 40. 7, 8. *and* Rom. 3. 31.

Reply. I have Re-vindicated all these Scriptures from his unsound sense, and expounded them in a right sense, with the concurrence and approbation of the Orthodox in Chap. 3. and elsewhere, and therefore this charge of Heresie doth also vanish as a mist before the Sun.

His

His third Charge of Hereſie runs thus:

For denying the Imputation of Chriſts obedience unto Juſtification, contrary to Rom. 4. *and* Rom. 5. 19. *and Phi.* 3. 9.

Reply. I have alſo fully Re-vindicated theſe Scriptures from his unſound ſenſe, and given the Reader the true ſenſe, and ſo this charge of Hereſie may more juſtly be retorted to the giver thereof; *For the Curſe that is cauſleſs, ſhall not come on the innocent*, Prov. 26. 2. *But it will return to the giver thereof*, according to *Pſal.* 109. 17, 31.

2 By the Table of chief Heads, and by the Table of Scriptures annexed, the Reader may pleaſe to ſearch out the ſeveral pages where the ſaid ſeveral Scriptures are Re-vindicated from Mr. *Nortons* falſe gloſſes, and there he ſhall find the genuine ſenſe of them clearly diſcovered.

3 Hence the five Divines that ſubſcribed the Letter at the end of Mr. *Nortons* Book, may ſee their great unadviſedneſs in joyning with Mr. *Norton*, to condemn the precious truth of the bleſſed Scriptures, for Hereſie, and to approve of his perverted ſenſe.

4 I will now conclude with a reference to *Lev.* 4. 13, 14. where a Church, a Synod, and a Conve of Elders and Magiſtrates, may ſee that they are ſometimes ſubject to Error in the things of God, and therefore they, as well as perſons of a lower capacity, had need to watch and pray, and to ſtudy daily, and earneſtly, that God would guide their judgements unto the ſound underſtanding, and righteous preſerving of the truth of his bleſſed Scriptures. *Amen.*

The Wiſe will underſtand, Dan. 12. 10.

Auſtin Cont. Fauſt. ſaith,

I paſs not for the cenſures of ſuch as dare to reprehend, what they do not Comprehend.

FINIS.

Errata.

Reader, Take notice that the first Figures stands for the Page, and the second for the Line.

Page 23, line 23 blot out Now it remains to be expounded, 40, 11 r. granted, 40, 16 r. sinning. 50, 10 r. by the Ordinances. 95, 25 r. affect. 113, 14 r. *Naboth*. 118, 10 r. *Wotton*. 130, 28 blot out He. 145, 10 for 25 r. 103. 148, 10 r. this. 161, 18 r. obrogate *ibid*. 22 r. that he shall not have *ib*. 25 r. *Wotton*. 164, 10 r. this. 175, 17 r. to act according to Physical causes in his moral obedience and natural actions, at the Dialogue doth reason in p. 111. l. 31, and as it is opened in c. 17. Rep. 31, & in c. 3. 176, 26. for Psal. r. page. 178, 33 r. Is. 53. 5, 10. 186, 8 r. c. 6. 192, 8 r. 152, 153, &c. 193, 19 blot out made, 196, 38 r. Goat Bucks. 206, ult. r. patience and obedience. 21, 11 r. laith he, 223, 16 r. *Wotton*. 232 from this page for 9 pages together, is false paged, make all these 9 pages 233. & then the pages following are right. 234, 16 r. p. 119. 238, 32 r. statute. 241, 29 r. disposition, and *Rutherford* on the Covenant doth at large concur with Mr. *Ball*. 243, 4 r. chiefly. 248, 13 blot out but, & r. and yet not be one person. 252, 13 r. this phrase of the Septuagint, the Apostle, &c. 252, 15 after fully purged, add compare herewith also Heb. 9. 22, 23. 258, 23 r. Christs body. 259, 35 blot out, it is in the same verses. r. the word Atonement is also explained by &c. 263, 38. r. both of his sufferings and of his death and sacrifice. 266, 2 r. his Argument. 273. 28 blot out And r. The only reason. 275. 11 r. was to cover and hide. 275, 28 r. themselves to Baal peor. 282, 19 r. groundless phantasies. 295, 15 for disease r. curse of evil. 299, 31 r. distaste. 307, 13 r. alone. 309, 9 r. this last Priestly act of his death. 311, 17 r. propounded. 323, 26 r. Ekthambe sthai, and so in p. 324, 327. 323, 8 r. to the last gasp; seeing he had got a confirmation against his sorrows by his prayers in the Garden, 326, 25 r. but Christs perfections could not be disturbed with that disorderly hasty fear, as they were in 2 King. 7. 15. 335, 25 add thus, 339, 21 r. Consecrator, 344. 31 r. Joh. 10. 11. 345, 12 r. usage, 362, 5 r. propounded, 363, 14 r. patients, 368, 17, blot out which, 371, in the Marginal note, r. *Azab* hath not two, 373, 39 r. Exod. 23. 5. 385, 39 r. tryed, 386, 26 r. against me, 395, 6 r. because he hath not hid. 415, 2 blot out to, 427, 20. r. derided by, *ib*. 37 r. therefore, 428, 28 r. else, 430, 29 r. thing, 432, 34 r. sanctification of merit, but not that of the Spirit.

Other faults there be which the Reader may mend.

XUM